The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XI | New York, Saturday, June 30, 1917 | Number 139

Contents

Editorial Notes 228

Leading Editorials
- Autocratic Administration 230
- The Ship Emergency 232
- A Reactionary Decision 234
- A Clearing-House for Orders 235

General Articles
- What Priority Means ..... Alvin Johnson 237
- British Imperial Reconstruction. . . . Alfred A. Zimmern 238
- Billy Sunday and the Historian. Joseph Ernest McAfee 241
- A Peace-Lover's War-Epic ..... Edith Wyatt 242
- Richesse Oblige 244

Correspondence 245

Verse: The History of a Minute ..... Alice Duer Miller 247

At the Capitol ..... C. M. 248

Books and Things ..... P. L. 249

Reviews of Books
- Another War ..... F. H. 250
- Governmental Finance ..... H. J. L. 251
- "Free-Hand" Architecture ..... A. C. H. 252
- Women of Belgium ..... E. S. S. 253
- Belated Excellence 255

AMERICA'S and Canada's task in feeding the Allies this coming year has reduced itself to a problem of fairly simple proportions. The latest available figures on the wheat supply are extremely illuminating. Roughly, we have or can plan upon one billion bushels of wheat this crop season. Bad weather may somewhat lower that figure, of course, but the conservative estimate, allowing a little for the unexpected, comes approximately to that. The amount is totalled thus: carryover, 100 millions; United States' crop, 650 millions; Canada's crop, 250 millions. Now by rigidly enforcing economy it may be possible for North America to get along by itself on something like 550 millions, although that will mean a "privation loaf." Furthermore, 90 millions must be saved for seed, and fully 50 millions more for a safe "carryover." We can, then, export something over 300 millions of bushels, from which we must deduct a certain amount for inevitable losses by submarines. Let us be optimistic and suppose that we are successful in landing the full 300 millions in France and England and Italy. Practically all other sources of supply are cut off from the Allies except North America—Russia and Rumania because of military conditions, not to speak of internal disorganization; British India and Australia because of the shortage of tonnage which makes the "long haul" impractical; South America because of bad crops that have caused her surplus to vanish. The burden then falls on this 300 millions of our own. But France and England and Italy, even paring down their consumption to the lowest possible level, need at least 500 millions of bushels of breadgrains over and above their own production. In other words, we may be able to supply them with 60 per cent of what they must have. Where is the other 40 per cent coming from? That is the problem which confronts Mr. Hoover and the Food Administration Board, and it will be incapable of solution without the patriotic coöperation of every citizen of the country.

THOSE who are convinced that national prohibition is not only desirable but practicable at this time will derive unmixed satisfaction from the action of the House in attaching a prohibition clause to the food bill. In their view drink and the devil are to be fought with any weapons that may come to hand. The clause is not so satisfactory to those who believe that national prohibition ought to be adopted or rejected on its own merits, not floated in on a wave of disquietude over the food question. It can not be said that the loss in foodstuffs through the production of alcoholic beverages represents a very conspicuous item of waste. It is less than two per cent of our cereal production. Our stock raisers waste a much larger percentage through improper feeding, and there is also reason to believe that much more food goes to waste in our kitchens than the breweries and distilleries consume. The House bill would also prohibit the manufacture of wine, since wine grapes must be technically classed as food. In fact, however, the greater part of the wine grape crop can be utilized in no other way. It will be left to rot on the vines.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GERMAN and British medical authorities know quite as much about the effect of alcohol upon industrial and military efficiency as we do. They have infinitely more reason to be disturbed over the food question than we have. They have reduced the production of alcoholic beverages to what they probably have good reason to believe is the lowest practicable limit. They have not resorted to prohibition, and there is no indication that they intend to do so. British and German legislators are taking this war seriously—something we have yet to learn to do—and are introducing war measures that are designed solely to strengthen the nation in war. It is not their endeavor to put the administration in a hole, or to make an embarrassing rearrangement of finances necessary, or to make the war unpopular. It is to be hoped that the Senate will have the courage to put this matter where for the present it belongs, in the hands of the Food Controller. Whatever restrictions may be placed upon the use of foodstuffs, in the production of alcoholic beverages, as part of a comprehensive plan of food control, will be generally accepted without murmuring. The enactment of a sweeping prohibition clause by Congress, on the other hand, is certain to give rise to widespread discontent, and at a time when we most need national harmony.

FINANCIAL volunteering as contrasted with financial conscription must be credited with two conspicuous successes. In the cases both of the Liberty Loan and of the Red Cross campaign the class of wealthy or the well-to-do Americans made a considerable contribution of time and money for public purposes from motives which were wholly or partly patriotic and disinterested; and they did this in spite of the probable enactment of a revenue bill which will take away a very substantial proportion of their incomes. The two campaigns offered most significant testimony to the continued vitality of the traditional American method of depending on the volunteer private effort to accomplish essential public purposes. The gentlemen who worked hardest for the success of the Liberty Loan and the Red Cross Fund were vindicating a tradition and a principle as well as accomplishing a difficult and important public work. They were seeking, in part unconsciously, to justify to themselves and to the public their valuable privileges by placing some of the fruits thereof at the disposal of the nation. No doubt they cannot permanently succeed. A democracy which conscripts human life has taken a long step in the direction of socialization. It must develop the policy by gradually doing away also with the volunteer principle in subordinating wealth for public purposes. But if the old tradition must disappear, one likes to see it go down gallantly with the colors flying and the band playing.

AMONG all the economic problems which have been forced on the administration by the war that of the famine prices now being charged for basic metals is probably the most dangerous and the most difficult. The enormous tax which the owners and smelters of important minerals are enabled to levy on the business of the country is creating a condition which it is impossible to ignore, and which cannot be cured without drastic action. It means huge profits for a comparatively few people, the extreme embarrassment of other kinds of business, popular uneasiness and discontent, and the probability of ultimate disorganization. The condition cannot be ignored, because if it is left alone it will increase for the duration of the war, and is likely to continue for a number of years after the coming of peace. Yet the administration may well be staggered by the prospect of having added to the dangerous discretionary tasks imposed upon it an additional task of such intrinsic difficulty as that of price determination. The job will bristle with problems for the solution of which there are no precedents, and with necessary decisions whose effects will be incalculable and explosive. Yet an administrator of raw materials is becoming as indispensable as a food administrator.

NEWSPAPER headlines in New York during the past ten days have made the war seem remote and have revived many of the happy memories of peace. Sometimes it has seemed as if the reading public after revelling in battles, massacres, declarations of war and bloody explosions could never go back to the round of its innocent, normal domestic interests, but the doubters have certainly done them an injustice. The discovery of the body of a murdered girl and the confession of the murderer have recalled the enviable days of the Rosenthal assassination. We can trust our newspapers to make the atrocities of peace no less renowned than those of war.

NOBODY denies that the chief present concern of the Shipping Board should be to keep the North Atlantic trade as well supplied with tonnage as may be practicable. But this should not be the only concern of our shipping authorities. It is of very great national importance that our trade with Latin America should not be starved out for want of carriers. We need raw materials from Latin America, and we also need the support to our financial structure that an uninterrupted flow of exports alone can give. Important international

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interests are also at stake. As a result of the total extinction of German and Belgian trade with Latin America and the reduction in British, French and Italian exporting power, the Latin-American peoples are forced to turn to us for many products necessary to their normal economic development. We assert a special concern in the prosperity of the American nations, and therefore we are bound to see that their economic interests shall not suffer needlessly from stoppage of supplies.

THOSE who have been fearing that America would become dangerously preoccupied with war efficiency must have been somewhat relieved by the recent New York State Military Census. In two weeks a staff of untrained volunteer workers were supposed to compile a census almost as large as that which it takes the federal authorities six months to finish. They were handicapped not only by the necessity for speed but by a multitude of conflicting instructions. A further source of confusion was the array of questions on the registration blank, which brimmed over with divisions and subdivisions for nearly all one's private and public relations, capacities and property. The statisticians who were consulted when the blank was made out protested against the wide scope for inaccuracy allowed by some of the questions and against the needless number of them, but their advice was disregarded. The consequences are that the amount of authentic information in the census is hardly worth the work, expense and bewilderment attendant on the taking of it. New York caught the idea from Connecticut, and it is to be hoped that amateur census-taking will spread no further. The federal government has never expressed any desire for this sort of aid.

A CABLE to the New York Times, from Mr. Grasty in Paris, says this: "There are two main sources of disturbance to the usually serene British mind . . . and the appointment of Lord Northcliffe as Commissioner in America." If ever two allied nations should help each other, now is the time. Since Englishmen are disturbed by Lord Northcliffe's absence we should send them somebody to take his place. We have nothing quite like Lord Northcliffe to offer, but let us give freely our least inferior substitute. He must be an owner of many newspapers, he must never be wrong about anything, his control of the English language must be more or less insecure. Such specifications point to a composite figure, a sort of William Randolph Munsey. If he does not exist, or declines to be exported, the best we can do is to set our ally an example in fortitude. The English will recover their missing serenity when they learn to take Lord Northcliffe's absence as easily as Americans are taking his presence.

Autocratic Administration

THE deep fear of unchecked executive power to which Senator Lodge has recently given utterance is probably the child of his obvious distrust in the efficiency of a Democratic government, but the sentiment is so widespread, and normally is so far justified that it is the more necessary to emphasize its momentary irrelevance. War is primarily a matter of administration, and reluctant as Congress is to accept the consequences of this truism, it must do so in the end. Every belligerent has discovered or demonstrated that war can not be run by debating methods. The administration may make wrong decisions; but in war any decisions are often better than no decisions. While discussion must continue it must be discussion of ways and means and not of the fundamental principles of government. America has yet to organize herself, and every hour that is spent in considering meticulously the exact degree to which certain powers may be wisely conferred delays the completion of that organization. Nor can you divide the accruing governmental powers. Their traditional separation has to be scrapped because it results in confusion. It does not pay. The House of Commons, a short time ago, passed a vote of five hundred millions sterling almost without debate. That was an innovation gigantic enough to amount to a revolution; but it was, in the circumstances, a necessary innovation. The technique of war is fundamentally distinct from the technique of peace.

Success in war is measured by the extent to which this distinction is quickly and fully realized in terms of policy. There are many who view with regret the submergence of certain English political institutions which had previously been considered fundamental to the life of the state. But new needs had arisen and it was necessary to supply those needs without delay. Hence the incongruous and remarkable mechanisms of democracy in war—secret sessions, premier-presidents, food-controllers, nationalized shipping, and the like. A war such as this is a series of shocks, and the chief business is to make traditional mechanisms respond with alacrity to its kaleidoscopic changes of demand. Academic debate as to whether the powers proposed to be conferred upon Mr. Hoover are those of "a Caesar or a Czar"—to use the elegant hyperbole of Senator Reed—is sheer futility. The only point to be seriously considered is whether the result of the innovation is likely to justify its adoption. We know that Mr. Hoover because of his experience and proved ability is particularly com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

petent to deal with the food situation. Beyond that our ignorance is so great and the situation is so critical that the nation has to confer upon him powers which are dangerously drastic in order to meet a need which can be stretched to such ominous limits. No doubt such a policy will be productive of mistakes, but at all events it will not be productive of indecision.

Herein lies the real reason of Mr. Asquith's fall. The greatest parliamentarian of his time, he was inferior to Mr. Lloyd-George in the paramount gift of issuing orders, of assuming responsibility and of reacting immediately to a given set of facts. If Mr. Lloyd-George's decisions are unsuccessful, he, too, will pay the penalty of failure in retirement. The rigidity in our own system prevents an equally quick response to the adverse judgment of the electorate, but if Mr. Hoover does fail, we may be very certain that he will not long retain office. The fundamental need is that he should be given his opportunity. Whether we like it or not the rest must be left to the test of the event.

It may be urged that this is undemocratic. The one answer to this charge has at any rate the virtue of simplicity. It is undemocratic. War is hateful precisely because of its incompatibility with democracy. It teaches the essentially conventional basis of civilization, that all safeguards against the abuse of power are inadequate save those which have been wrought for the normal life of civilization. A government which can, like that of Germany, consciously will war is in fact committing the final offense against democracy. That is the fundamental point in the accusation against the German ruling class. Civilization cannot be certain of itself if the progress which has been so hardly won is lightly to be tampered with to serve a ruthless and inordinate ambition. The weakness of democratic government—in peace time it is its strength—consists in its distribution of power; but it is precisely unity of power which war most sternly demands.

Congress, consequently, must adopt the makeshift most convenient to the immediate purpose. It must confer plenary power because in its absence failure is almost certain to result. But the exercise of power is made conditional on its successful use. Although this is, of course, undemocratic in the sense that it substitutes a private and absolute will for the voice of the popular representative body, we cannot pick and choose in such a crisis. In awaiting the outcome democrats can cherish one consolation. If the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, we shall not lose our liberties, for the opponents of the administration are anticipating with unconcealed eagerness the failure of its domestic policy. They are submitting after protest to the delegation of autocratic power in the expectation of its misuse and consequent unpopularity. If they are right in their surmise, the country is adopting the one sure way of justifying them. If they are not right, the country will be saved much suffering; it will have ended a stagnation of irresolution that is doing to it small credit in the eyes of the world.

Whether the autocratic war administration succeeds or fails, the situation is sufficiently paradoxical. The nation has entered the war in order to safeguard the interests of democracy against powerful and unscrupulous enemies. Its enemies are so powerful that in order to prevent them from being victorious many of the safeguards of democracy at home have to be suspended. If the autocratic military administration is successful, the safeguarding of democracy abroad will have to be purchased by the imperiling of its domestic safeguards. If the war administration is unsuccessful, democracy in domestic affairs will apparently be vindicated at the expense of its ability to improvise, accept and employ the necessary agencies of its survival in the outside world. In either event the future of democracy seems precarious.

The paradox must be credited with some measure of reality, but it is not so exhaustive and inevitable as many friends and many enemies of democracy imagine. Both its apprehensive friends and its confident enemies prophesy more damage from the exigencies of war than democracy can possibly gain from the successful writing of a democratic program into the treaty of peace. In this they are probably mistaken. Democracy in America has a far better chance of gaining from participation in the war than it had from refusing to participate. But no matter how much we may believe in the probable gain from American participation, the danger to democracy which comes from mixing it with war must be admitted and the greatest care should be taken to mitigate it. The essential precaution to be observed by the temporary autocracy is that of avoiding the use of discretionary and irresponsible powers in an inflexible and headstrong spirit. An autocratic organization has to be improvised, but if the authority of a dictator has to be frequently and drastically employed, it will fail to serve a democratic purpose, and will either subjugate its victims or be nullified eventually by them. Even in war the policy of a sincere democracy and its administration must rest on a preponderance of consent. Administrative autocracy is a device to prevent violence rather than to repress, provoke or embody it. The citizens of a democracy must be rendered willing to play their part in the effective organization of national military power, because they understand and approve so completely of the purposes for which it is used.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Ship Emergency

AT the present rate of ship-attrition, everyone agrees, England within a definite number of months will be essentially an island under qualified siege. The British people will not only be requiring more wheat than they can possibly receive, they will also be demanding war materials at a rate that cannot possibly be satisfied. Considering the lines of communication that run out from England to France, to Italy, to the Mediterranean, the havoc made by the submarine cannot be judged solely by the requirements of the British people. There is also the hunger of armies at distant bases, the hunger of Italy for coal, the hunger of the guns. It is true that a plan may still be put in effect as deadly to the submarine as the submarine is deadly to freight steamers. In the absence of such an eliminative agent, however, there is nothing to disguise the validity of the German program, especially in view of the steady addition of new submarines.

Up to last February the margin of English security was nearly as ample as it had been at the beginning of the war. It was so great that it seemed permanently unassailable. But the ruthless submarine policy had been launched very few weeks before Americans perceived that the situation was seriously changed. Early in March, nearly four months ago, Americans distinctly saw that the balance in shipping would be dangerously turned by the submarine unless ships were constructed fast enough in all quarters to neutralize the losses. It needed very little English confession as to those losses to make it clear that American ship construction had become indispensable and imperative. Because of England's obvious dependence on shipping, because of the submarine's effectiveness in destroying shipping and the desperate hopes that had sanctioned its use, the crucial position of the United States as a country with unlimited resources became apparent even before we entered the war.

American recognition of the emergency was so sharp that an organization which had existed before we entered the war, the United States Shipping Board, added a body for the express purpose of coping with ship-attrition and named it the Emergency Fleet Corporation. The same zeal that branded "emergency" in the title of the fleet corporation led the Shipping Board, through its chairman William Denman, to go to a man whose name was synonymous with effectiveness, General Goethals, and urge him to leave his own work as a consulting engineer and give up his ambition to lead troops in France for the sake of organizing the speedy production of a great number of freight steamers.

Having had no direct experience to prepare him for this colossal job, General Goethals did his best to have Mr. Denman pick out someone else for it. There was no one else in sight, however, and the emergency being so clear and General Goethals's record so significant, the highest authority was invoked to compel him to assume the responsibility. As the conditions were in many ways so similar to those under which the Canal was built, the requirements being to organize contractors to procure a given result against time, the full responsibility was imposed on General Goethals, and except for the O. K. of the Shipping Board to the contracts that he was to issue, he was allowed full power.

When General Goethals came to Washington to organize the building of ships he found that preliminary plans for the construction of a large number of wooden vessels were being entertained by the Shipping Board, at the instance of Mr. Eustis and Mr. Clark. Mr. Eustis and Mr. Clark believed that the best way to meet an emergency so sharp and perilous as the shipping emergency was to find out the kind of carrying vessel that could most quickly be constructed with due regard to the possibilities of getting through to England. Seeking ships that could be made of ready material by ready labor on a standardized plan in the shortest time, they concluded that wooden ships could be made available in great numbers much more rapidly than steel ships or composite ships, and were indeed the only ships that could be made in time to keep England from being crippled by the submarine. The advocacy of building wooden vessels, fully a thousand of them, hinged practically altogether on this argument of time, and on this basis was presented to General Goethals.

One of the chief handicaps to the construction of the Panama Canal was the impatience of the American people to see "dirt fly." Whether or not General Goethals approached the consideration of an emergency wooden fleet with this danger in mind, he was not long manager of the corporation before he let it be known that a fleet of a thousand wooden ships was out of the question, and most of the wooden ship contractors dispersed. Contracts went out for wooden hulls and wooden ships as well as for steel ships and composite vessels, but the number of vessels arranged for was only 104 by the middle of June, and it was intimated that two hundred or possibly three hundred wooden ships were the most that would ever be ordered.

While everyone is agreed that steel ships are better than wooden ships, and that nothing whatever should interfere with building as many of them as possible, the reason for limiting

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the total of wooden ships had nothing to do, apparently, with any prospect of rapid delivery of steel ships. The steel ships that were ordered were in some cases promised for January and February, but most of them for next April and much later. The objection to placing contracts for wooden vessels apparently came, in the first place, from the failure of Mr. Eustis and Mr. Clark to win General Goethals to the approval of their scheme, and in the next place came from a curious difference of opinion as to the merits of alternate designs.

The two designs for wooden ships that survived the first sifting were the Ferris design and the Hough design. Everyone seems to concede that the Ferris design is much more attractive than the Hough, but the simplicity of the Hough model enables it to be built much more quickly, according to some opinions, and requires for its construction fewer traditional shipwrights and much more easily procurable sizes of timber. After consultation with Mr. Hough, Mr. Ferris himself, as naval expert for the corporation, approved the construction of Hough ships with certain modifications that Mr. Hough adopted. Later on, however, he wrote a letter to General Goethals which placed restrictions on his own approval:

HOUGH'S TYPE OF WOOD SHIP

In reference to my approval of the construction of the above ship with strength additions, as per my letter addressed to you under date of May 27th, I wish to have you understand I did not approve the type of this ship and its construction with any thought that there would be a vast number of these ships built or the construction of any type would be substituted for our standard ship if there should be any thought or plan of procedure in this direction for the reason that this type of construction of ship cannot and will not be equal to the vessels proposed under the standard plans and specifications. The latter to be adhered to and adopted excepting in special cases, where it is advantageous for specific reasons to build the Hough type of construction of ship, to the number of which there should be some reasonable limit.

I should have to state this condition in my approval of the proposition under date of May 27th, and please excuse my neglect for not then doing so.

Very truly yours,

THEO. E. FERRIS.

This afterthought of Mr. Ferris, indicating that the Ferris was preferable to the Hough design "excepting in special cases," had the effect of deciding General Goethals not to take the responsibility for building Hough boats outside a limited number that were already ordered, to be built under the personal supervision of Mr. Hough. The statements that Mr. Eustis and Mr. Clark thereafter sent to the press, making various criticisms of their chief and alleging delay in the construction of ships, led General Goethals to discharge them from the Emergency Fleet Corporation for "lack of loyalty and misstatement and misrepresentation of facts." This action did not affect Mr. Eustis's position as an agent of the Shipping Board, and the Shipping Board retained in its service the man whom General Goethals had discharged.

Whether or not this incident has been prejudicial to the relations between Mr. Denman, chairman of the Shipping Board, and General Goethals, manager of the Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, the fact remains that various contracts for ships have gone long unsigned by Mr. Denman, and a new issue raised about the price, or the provisional price, of steel. Thus the power that was entrusted to General Goethals is in effect pointedly criticized by the advocates of the Hough type of wood ship, and has not only been criticized but has been impeded by Mr. Denman.

If there was no emergency on the sea these disagreements would be of minor importance. With an emergency as definite as the torpedo-strength of Germany, they become intolerable. A plan has been suggested by which the responsibilities of the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the Shipping Board be disjoined, the Fleet Corporation to control all matters that pertain to ships up to the water-line, the Shipping Board to administer United States resources in ships once they are in the water. This proposal is aimed at the dislocation between General Goethals' responsibility and his powers, but for all its merit as a practical proposal it leaves untouched the moot question of wooden ships.

Where General Goethals is expert is in administration, and it is of secondary importance whether men suffer unhappiness under the process of his administration if the particular job he undertakes to accomplish is carried out. The building of wooden ships is not, however, entirely a question of administration, certainly not entirely a question of economical administration. The wooden ship project requires an experimental attitude, because of the novelty of the scheme, its magnitude and its promise. To leave it to even the greatest administrator in the world might be a psychological mistake.

So long as the United States has resources for wood and steel ships both, there is no conflict between the two schemes, either as to material or labor or management. On this account there is no reason why the wooden ship project should not be made as completely independent of General Goethals as General Goethals should be made practically independent of the Shipping Board. Under the right manager for wooden ship construction, better results may be expected from this ar-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rangement than can ever be expected under the manifestly reluctant direction of General Goethals.

The cry of criticism need not be raised. It is no criticism of General Goethals that he be asked either to mature or to relinquish a project that has the greatest promise. The fact that he distrusts and despises the project is an argument against it, but not a final argument, especially with ship-attrition and an increased number of submarines the rule of the day. Is it fair to introduce such an element of revision into our arrangements? The question is almost nonsensical. The history of the high command in France, in Germany, in England, during this war is the conclusive answer to a stand-pat policy.

A Reactionary Decision

PUBLIC attention has been so completely absorbed in the war that one of the most important decisions rendered by the Supreme Court this year has passed almost unnoticed. On June 11th, the court held unconstitutional a law of the state of Washington, making it unlawful for private employment agencies to charge fees to workmen. The decision was by a five to four vote, the majority condemning the law as "arbitrary and oppressive," and unduly restrictive of the "liberty" guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment.

To grasp the full gravity of this reactionary decision, the social background of the law must be vizualized. It is sketched with detailed thoroughness in Mr. Justice Brandeis's dissenting opinion. The private employment agency has for years been recognized as one of the sore points of irritation in the industrial machine. It preys on the ignorant and the unskilled, exacting its tribute when the stress of unemployment renders them defenseless. It charges extortionate fees, and performs services which are often illusory. The evidence produced by Mr. Justice Brandeis's opinion is overwhelming that they are subject to the grossest frauds and dishonesties. Workmen are sent on long trips to jobs which prove to be non-existent. Collusive arrangements with employers are frequent, by which workmen are employed for a few days, and then discharged, so that the agency can find them new jobs and exact new tributes. The employment agency thrives on the dislocation of labor and on casual employment, and is as much interested in creating unemployment as in alleviating it. For all this there was the most ample evidence. The United States Bureau of Labor reported that "the nature of their business is such as to make possible most iniquitous practices." The Commission on Industrial Relations, appointed by President Wilson, found that "the business as a whole reeks with fraud, extortion, and flagrant abuses of every kind."

Regulation of these abuses had failed. A careful student of the problem wrote, in 1914, that "twenty-four states and the District of Columbia have attempted to regulate private employment agencies, and have made a miserable failure of it." The Commission on Industrial Relations concluded that the abuses were inherent, and could not be remedied by regulation. The American Association of Public Employment Agencies recommended the abolition of private agencies. The State of Washington itself had tried indirect regulation, by establishing public employment agencies, successfully conducted at a cost of four cents per position filled, as compared with the normal private agency charge of $1.00 to $2.00. Yet the private agency, with its swindling practices, continued to exact its tribute.

In 1914, Washington applied an organic remedy. By a large majority, an initiative measure was adopted by popular vote, making it unlawful for a private employment agency to charge a fee to any person seeking employment. The state declared its deliberate policy that the cost of bringing together men and jobs must be borne by the employers, or by the community, and that it should not be exacted as tribute from the class least able to pay it. The measure was the outcome of years of bitter experience, in a state in which the problem was exceptionally acute, and it was considered, as Mr. Justice Brandeis says, "A necessary preliminary to the establishment of a constructive policy for dealing with the subject of unemployment,"—"Perhaps the gravest and most difficult problem of modern industry."

This measure the Supreme Court has now nullified. What are the reasons for the decision? Mr. Justice McReynolds gives them very briefly: "But we think it plain that there is nothing inherently immoral or dangerous to public welfare in acting as paid representative of another to find a position in which he can earn an honest living. On the contrary, such service is useful, commendable, and in great demand." A few platitudes from state courts are cited to support this opinion; no other evidence is produced. The mass of irresistible testimony adduced by Mr. Justice Brandeis is ignored, or dismissed with the statement that all professions and most businesses offer opportunities for abuse, and that "skilfully directed agitation might also bring about apparent condemnation of any one of them by the public." Some generalities about liberty and property complete the opinion.

Decisions of this sort emphasize a situation that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is fast becoming intolerable. The Adamson law was sustained by a five to four decision; the Minimum Wage law by four to four; the vote in the Workmen's Insurance law case was five to four, and in the Ten Hour law case, five to three. These laws were barely saved, but until last week it seemed still possible that the liberal element in the Supreme Court, led by Justices Holmes and Brandeis, might prevail. The present decision dashes those hopes to the ground. If the Employment Agencies law is contrary to due process, no new social legislation can be considered safe in the hands of the Supreme Court.

A Clearing-House for Orders

IN the report which the Director of the Council of National Defense, Mr. W. S. Gifford, submitted on Monday to his chairman, the Secretary of War, there appears an exceedingly optimistic summary of "a few of the concrete accomplishments" for which the Council and its Advisory Commission are already responsible. "The mobilization of the 262,000 miles of railroads of the country for the government's defense" has an assuring ring; but only a more than usually credulous reader will be convinced that the 262,000 miles of railroad of the country have been mobilized for the defense of government, in seven weeks, and without recourse to the legal assistance for which the railroads are still impatiently waiting. If anything, there is more harm than good in the statement, made in the same report, that there is already assured as a definite accomplishment "the very general acceptance by labor and capital of the suggestion of the Council that existing labor standards should not be changed until the need for such action has been determined by the Council." State legislatures and patriotic manufacturers in various parts of the country are, unfortunately, demonstrating that the acceptance of any such suggestion is far from being general. The report of the Director of the Council carries no note of warning, and may indeed produce some relaxation of vigilance on the part of those who are alert. And somewhat the same too confident assurance is implied in what is said with regard to priority. "The method adopted," states the report, "is simply to furnish a clearing-house for the orders that involve material in which a national shortage exists or is anticipated. Where manufacturing facilities are insufficient, the Board directs its efforts to developing new facilities."

There are certain definite steps which must be taken before what is here set forth in theory can be made good in action, and for these steps a wiser report would have prepared the way. In the charted system of blocks and circles that constitute the war organization the Priority Committee appears as a subcommittee under the General Munitions Board, which, in turn, attaches itself directly to the Council of National Defense, through Mr. Gifford, rather than to the Advisory Commission, as is the case with most subordinate war agencies. It is a committee of representatives from various existing offices, with a chairman—General Aleshire—from the War Department, an Assistant Secretary from the Department of Agriculture, no one from the Shipping Board, one member—Mr. Joseph E. Davies—from the Federal Trade Commission, two admirals from the Navy—but no organization below, for the purpose of inquiry and investigation. As in the case of the Priority Department in England, the Committee is designed to act as an adjudicating and harmonizing body in every form of production to which shortage in raw materials brings distress. It is to deal with the munitions of industry as well as munitions of the army. With an organization of four hundred people, the English committee determines the order in which contracts or parts of contracts are to be filled, distinguishing between "war work," work immediately required to maintain continuity of output without extension, and work of any other sort. In this country the theory is to be much the same, but a good part of the equipment is lacking.

The typical problem, now, which comes to the Priority Committee is of this sort: Brown Brothers, in Chicago, write in with an inquiry about tubes for marine engines. "The plant upon which we were counting," they state, "has notified us that it will not be able to fill our orders because of the government contracts which it has had to take on. What can you do for us?" In its present development, the Committee cannot do a great deal. Are the engines to be fitted in merchant vessels that will constitute an integral part of the war machine, or are they for pleasure craft? How important are the contracts which the government has given to the second concern? Where is a factory which is turning out marine engine tubes, and not disposing of them for purposes which are indispensable? The Priority Committee has not the data for wise action when it attacks the individual problem. Though in theory it covers as wide a field as does the Priority Department in England, it has nothing of the field organization upon which the English agency depends. Obviously, before it can handle problems in adjudication, it must be given a network of information and inspectors who can tell it how necessary engine tubes are to Brown Brothers, and how necessary Brown Brothers' engines are to the war. In no

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other way will it be able to advise the government whether to withdraw from one contract in the greater interest it will derive, less directly, from another. Preferably the appropriation needed to set up this organization will come from the lump-sum which was placed in the hands of the President on April 9th. For the recent experiences of the Department of Labor, in being refused small sums for valuable work, have demonstrated again that it is easier to get a battleship from Congress than a few needed additions to an administrative staff. The party in power is always on guard against the cry of job-making which the opposition will raise, no matter what the merits of increases asked.

An effective organization, however, is not the only requisite for want of which the Priority Committee has not been able to progress as satisfactorily as the Director's report implies it is progressing. In England priority power has retained confidence everywhere by working not through dictation but through persuasion and negotiation. But when a decision has been made by the Committee it applies rigorously. An order from the Priority Department bears the legal force which Parliament has given to the Ministry of Munitions. What corresponding power has the Priority Committee which has been set up in Washington?

It has, under the organic act which created the Council of National Defense, authority "to supervise and direct investigations and make recommendations to the President and the heads of the executive departments" as to railroads, waterways, and a wide field of industrial enterprise. Implied here is an extension of whatever power of actual decision rests with the Departments. The Priority Committee has also, as perhaps its chief instrument, the authority granted by the terms of the Naval Appropriations act of March 4th, 1917. Under these terms the President, in this case the Priority Committee, may place an order for ships or war material "of the nature, kind, and quantity usually produced or capable of being produced" by any manufacturer—and insist that this order shall be obligatory, "at such reasonable price as shall be determined by the President." Should that authority fall short, the President is empowered "to requisition and take over for use or operation by the government any factory or any part thereof without taking possession of the entire factory, whether the United States has or has not any contract or agreement with the owner or occupier of such factory." But "war material" in the terms of the act is defined as "arms, armament, ammunition, stores, supplies and equipment for ships [of the Navy] and airplanes, and everything required for or in connection with the production thereof." A very similar definition of materials is carried in the Urgent Deficiencies act of June 20th, which provides powers of requisition and control in the production of the new fleet of merchant ships. But tubes for marine engines wanted by Brown Brothers of Chicago come under neither of these acts, if the engines are to be used in purely private enterprise. Nor do steel for freight car trucks, copper for a telephone company's wires, or coal for a factory which has no direct contribution to the government's war program. Priority powers in railway matters are soon to be given to the Coöperative Committee on Transportation, in a bill which has passed the Senate and is pending in the House; priority powers in food production, and in the manufacture of agricultural implements, will be conferred upon Mr. Hoover by the passage of the food-control bill. But there remains uncovered by legislation a vast field of private industry, whose units are beginning to turn to the Priority Committee for an assistance which it can give them only through the pressure of its prestige.

Whether or not priority in this field is to be provided by law, the immediate needs of the Priority Committee seem clear. It must first of all reorganize itself on a compact and more adjustable plan. It must be given a field organization which, through constantly accumulated data, will supply standards by which it may apply the policies which it has worked out for itself. There must, moreover, be a close organization between the Priority Committee, the Food Administration, and the Coöperative Committee on Transportation. Unless the three agencies pool their problems in priority, the legislation which has been enacted, or will be forced in the future by a serious shortage in raw materials, cannot be put into effect with a maximum of accomplishment.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1917, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS
HERBERT CROLY FRANCIS HACKETT
PHILIP LITTELL ALVIN JOHNSON
GEORGE SOULE, Assistant Editor
CHARLES MERZ, Washington Representative

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE: REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Priority Means

PRIORITY must be accorded to the services of war. When an army is to be moved all means of transport in sight are commandeered. When an army is to be fed, civilians protest in vain against the seizure of stores. So matters have stood since time immemorial. This is why it now seems merely common sense to enact a law giving the President authority to claim priority in the transportation of goods essential to the prosecution of the war. Whether the output of steel mills shall be assigned to the building of war ships, merchant ships, railways, office buildings or summer hotels, should, we all feel, be determined by a like principle of priority. If we have as yet no law guaranteeing priority for military requirements in the field of production, we feel that this is merely a gap in our war arrangements, to be stopped for the present by patriotic action on the part of the producers themselves.

What is novel in the present day conception of priority is its breadth of scope. When the whole industry of a nation is mobilized behind the fighting line, it is not merely finished munitions that must be given priority in transportation, but also the materials and fuel for further munitions production. The food supply of the industrial population, as well as that of the army, has a claim to priority. So also have clothing supplies, lumber for housing, and whatever else is essential to working efficiency. In production it would be impossible to fix definite limits upon the application of the priority principle. We can not much longer permit the free flotation of the securities of foreign enterprises, nor even of the less essential domestic enterprises, so long as national loans or issues designed to finance railways or industrial enterprises of prime necessity are to be floated. Modern warfare, in involving the whole national life, has made inevitable a control of business practically coextensive with the economic system.

The application of the priority principle to transportation and production is quite in accord with plain common sense. It is none the less revolutionary in its social economic implications. What it means is that necessities shall have right of way. If we have excess productive capacity, the unessentials and luxuries may be provided, but not otherwise. And necessities are definable in terms that take account only of physical requirements. There is no room in the definition for class distinctions. A new country house may seem a matter of necessity to the man of fortune, but he will persuade no priority board to permit shipment of building materials while cars are needed for coal or wheat. Nor will he persuade them to let him have lumber that could be used for ships or working men's camps, or labor that could be employed to advantage in production for more clearly national and democratic needs.

In time of peace there was a principle of priority operating, but its nature was wholly different. It was a priority of the purse. The fastest transcontinental freight trains were those that conveyed Japanese silk from Puget Sound to the Atlantic seaboard. Silk had right of way under the rule of the purse. If there was a shortage of building material or of carpenter's labor, it did not operate to postpone the erection of the rich man's country mansion. Its natural effect was to leave unsolved the problem of congestion in the working men's quarters of our industrial cities. Often there was shortage of labor in the tomato canneries, but there never was shortage of labor in the establishments devoted to the preparation of caviare. Society was unable to produce sufficient clothing to preserve the children of the poor from death by exposure, but it could find a score of men to labor for weeks in Arctic icefields to provide a prima donna with superfluous furs. Our productive organization in peace is designed to satisfy needs, but needs counting in the scale not according to intensity of feeling, but according to the magnitude of the associated purchasing power. In peace our production is directed by money prices. In war it tends to be directed by human values. In peace the inequalities in the distribution of income are reflected in the things we produce and the things we do without. In war we cannot afford to let men starve because they are poor or waste because they are rich. We are not greatly concerning ourselves about the distribution of income, but we intend to have, for the time, a socially rational distribution of our productive power. And this is economic revolution.

It is a revolution, however, that almost escapes notice because it preserves the institution of profit which appears to most of us as the essential element in our traditional economic system. We order our railways to transport motor trucks instead of touring cars, but we pay them for the service. We order our steel industry to furnish materials for ship-building instead of scenic railways, but the steel industry is to have its fair profit out of its patriotic service. We order our farmers to produce food enough for us all, and for our Allies as well, but we do not ask them to take gratitude for the chief part of their reward. Production

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under the control of money prices paid. We intend to make production under the control of human values pay as well. How can we do it?

Our recipe is simple. We shall build ships in numbers determined by our national need. These ships will earn freights. Perhaps the freights will be sufficient to cover interest and depreciation, and in this case the operation "pays" in the traditional sense. If the freights are not sufficient, the deficit will be made good through taxation. We are likely to guarantee the producer a minimum price for wheat. Perhaps the market will justify the price; otherwise we shall make up the difference through taxation. Our industrial workers will have to be fed and clothed and housed according to the standards set by considerations of full efficiency. Perhaps their products will sell at prices yielding wages sufficient to meet this requirement. And perhaps not. In the latter event, resort must again be had to taxation.

Taxation of whom? Not of those who had too little to cover the necessities of life, for that would be to defeat the national purpose. No, the taxes that are to make it profitable to supply necessaries before luxuries must come in the last instance from those whose incomes afforded the luxuries. And thus in its endeavor to redistribute productive power so as to give priority to the more pressing needs, the state at war is borne along a course that ends in what is in effect a redistribution of income.

But when the war is over shall we not return to the condition in which production is directed by money prices, and reflects precisely the inequalities of income, growing greater, possibly, in the speculative era of reconstruction? The obligations a government undertakes in war are not soon liquidated. A working class that has seen the priority of its essential needs recognized through the years of national crisis will not be content with the restoration of a state in which the more or less frivolous requirements of other classes are given preference over those needs. After the war there will be years when the food problem, the problem of wool and leather, the problem of coal and raw materials of industry will weigh heavily upon the leaders of the nation. They will have to manage somehow to maintain a priority for such vital necessities. And in the meantime it will be hard to keep the principle of priority of necessities from becoming ingrained in the social consciousness, if not more or less formally established in political institutions.

ALVIN JOHNSON.

British Imperial Reconstruction

AMID the constitutional changes which are taking place or being contemplated as a result of the war in almost all the belligerent countries the evolution of the British Commonwealth under the pressure of war conditions is not the least striking or hopeful. If it has excited little attention abroad it is because it is taking place so silently and after the British fashion, almost naturally, that its full importance has not been appreciated. A brief account of recent developments and their significance may, therefore, be of interest to American readers: for they involve a change in the character of the executive responsible for the government of one-quarter of the human race.

One of the very first acts of the Lloyd George government on its entry into office last December was to invite representatives of the over-sea Dominions and of India to London to take part, not in an Imperial Conference of the ordinary type, but in a series of special and continuous meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet to discuss the problems of the war itself and of the coming settlement. The step thus taken was noteworthy in several ways. Hitherto the formal meetings of the Dominion representatives with the Imperial Government have taken place in what have been known as Imperial Conferences, at which subjects of interest to the various Dominions have been discussed and resolutions arrived at in the form of recommendations to the various governments represented. But never before have Dominion representatives been invited actually to sit as a body in the Imperial Cabinet or to share on equal terms in the discussion of vital questions of foreign policy and war and peace. Still more noteworthy was the addition of Indian representatives to such a gathering. Four representatives of India were invited to take part in the special series of Cabinet meetings—the Secretary of State for India, and three representatives from the country itself, Sir James Meston, Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces, an official well known for his liberal sympathies, the Maharajah of Bikanir, ruler of one of the most progressive of the native states, and Sir S. P. Sinha, a Calcutta lawyer and a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council. The delegates reached London in the middle of March and the sittings went on till the end of April. All the Dominions were represented except Australia, which was unable to send anyone owing to the impending general election.

From the constitutional point of view the situa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion during the presence of the Dominion representatives was somewhat bewildering, at any rate to an outsider. Three separate bodies have been meeting and transacting important business. First, the Imperial War Cabinet, which sat two or three times a week. This was for the time being the real executive of the British Empire so far as the main business of the day (i. e., the war) was concerned. It consisted of the five members of the ordinary War Cabinet and the Dominion and Indian representatives. Second, there was the ordinary War Cabinet of five which sat on other days of the week. This is also an executive body, but it confined itself for the time being for the most part to discussing domestic affairs (i. e., United Kingdom questions) in which the Dominion representatives would not desire to interest themselves. Third, an Imperial Conference on the usual lines was held at the Colonial Office under the chairmanship of the Colonial Secretary—with this difference from its previous procedure, that Indians were for the first time admitted. The distinction between these three gatherings and the subjects which they respectively handle had not been thought out beforehand but grew up under the pressure of necessity in the usual British manner. But it indicates what may prove to be an important point of departure in British constitutional policy. We have slipped without knowing into the differentiation, which logical thinkers have always declared must ultimately come to pass, between the government of the Commonwealth as a whole and the government of the United Kingdom. The three bodies which have been meeting during the last two months represent three different classes of subjects: 1. Questions common to the whole Empire, which must be dealt with by a single central government. 2. Questions solely concerning the government and electors of the United Kingdom. 3. Inter-Dominion questions, i. e., matters concerning the whole Empire which can best be dealt with, not by a central single government but by method of conference between local governments. Thus, for instance, the Imperial Cabinet has been discussing the conduct of the war, the domestic Cabinet has been discussing a minimum wage for agricultural labor in the United Kingdom, and the Imperial Conference has been discussing such questions as Imperial preference, immigration, naturalization, double income-tax, etc.

Another constitutional change which may be of interest to American students of British constitutional practice has taken place since the advent of the Lloyd George government. The Cabinet has discarded the tradition by which it remained an informal committee with no written minutes of any kind and has developed a secretariat of its own. A Dominion Premier who was invited to be present at a meeting of the Cabinet in 1915 lately expressed in private his amazement at the transformation which he found had taken place on his recent visit in the working of the chief executive body of the British Empire. He found a complete secretariat installed, printed minutes of the proceedings of the last meeting circulated, secretaries present during the meetings themselves and a wholly new atmosphere in the gathering. It is difficult to say how many of these innovations will be retained after the small War Cabinet of to-day has been replaced by a peace cabinet of the ordinary type. Protests are already loud in some quarters against the unconstitutional character of the new secretariat. It is regarded as an additional barrier interposed between the Cabinet and the House of Commons. But it is difficult to see wherein exactly the new secretariat differs, constitutionally speaking, from a government department of the ordinary kind, and its survival seems likely to depend rather upon its own record than upon the question of constitutional principle. Its chief interest, from the point of view of Americans, is that it consists of relatively young men who have been brought in from outside in the American fashion rather than of civil servants who have joined the service through examination and made their way up in the ordinary manner. It is easy to see that such arrangements open the door to patronage and favoritism; but they also offer scope to a certain freshness of mind and outlook which is not without its own value, especially in times of revolutionary change.

But the most important result of the visit of the Dominion and Indian representatives has been the decision arrived at by them in the Imperial Conference for the calling of a new conference directly after the war to discuss the whole question of the future constitution of the Empire. The resolution passed on this subject is so important that it deserves to be textually quoted.

> The Imperial War Conference is of the opinion that the readjustment of the Constitutional relations of the component parts of the Empire is too important and intricate a subject to be dealt with during the war and that it should form the subject of a special Imperial Conference to be summoned as soon as possible after the cessation of hostilities.
>
> They deem it their duty, however, to place on record their view that any such readjustment, while thoroughly preserving all existing powers of self-government and complete control of domestic affairs, should be based upon a full recognition of the Dominions as autonomous nations of an Imperial Commonwealth, and of India as an important portion of the same; should recognize the right of the Dominions of India to an adequate voice in foreign policy and in foreign relations; and should provide effective arrangements for continuous consultation in all important matters

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> of common Imperial concern, and for such necessary concerted action, founded on consultation, as the several Governments may determine.
>
> The Imperial War Conference desires to place on record its view that the resolution of the Imperial Conference of April 20, 1907, should be modified to permit of India being fully represented at all future Imperial Conferences, and that the necessary steps should be taken to secure the assent of the various governments in order that the next Imperial Conference may be summoned and constituted accordingly.

Several points in this complex resolution should be specially noted. Perhaps the most important is the discarding of the word *Empire* in favor of the word *Commonwealth*. This is not a mere matter of nomenclature but the recognition of what may be described as a new philosophy, for it involves the placing of India and her representatives upon an equal footing in the councils of the Commonwealth with the representatives of the United Kingdom and the self-governing Dominions. It is true that so far as the internal affairs of India are concerned she will continue to be subject to the Secretary of State for India, who is responsible to the electors of the British Isles. British constitutional practice has never shrunk from illogicality. In the new arrangement, which, however illogical, commends itself universally to public opinion, representatives of India, which remains for the present, as regards her own internal affairs, without a responsible government of the western type, are to sit and vote on equal terms in the Council Chamber with representatives of her rulers, the electors of the United Kingdom. Secondly, the resolution seems to bar out for the moment any more organic form of union than consultation. The word consultation is emphasized by being repeated twice in the resolution. The new system which is to be set up is to involve an annual meeting for purposes of consultation between separate and (in the case of the Dominions) autonomous governments. It is such an immense step forward for the Dominions to desire to assume their proportionate share of responsibility for the conduct of foreign policy and defense that public opinion in the United Kingdom is not likely to cavil at the limited character of the contemplated organization. It is, however, a little difficult to see how it will be possible to harmonize the new machinery of imperial consultation with the increasing desire of the electors of the United Kingdom to control the actions and policies of their own foreign minister. Much will depend upon the kind of issues that emerge in foreign policy during the post-bellum period. If the British Commonwealth should become a member of a League of Nations and has entered upon fixed engagements and agreements with a number of democratic allies, it is not likely that any very sudden new issues or situations in foreign policy would arise. For this reason the after war period would seem to be a good time for embarking on the very delicate constitutional experiment outlined in the Imperial Conference resolution.

In a statement to Parliament on May 19th explaining the Resolution of the Imperial Conference, the Prime Minister made it clear that it is contemplated to hold meetings of the new "Imperial Cabinet" at least once a year and expressed the hope that these annual meetings would become "an accepted convention" of the British Constitution. Thus, under our unwritten Constitution do constitutional amendments come about!

The resolution has been regarded in some quarters as a blow to the school of thought which desires to see a full scheme of imperial federation; one central government for the Commonwealth responsible to a single central parliament. Such a system would in point of fact be the only way in which it would be possible to democratize the foreign policy of the Commonwealth, and those who believe in the spread of democracy will not readily give up their view that such a system will ultimately be adopted. It has, however, always been clear that Dominion opinion was not likely for some time to come to be ripe for such a project. It is a great step forward towards the unity of the Commonwealth that the Dominions and India should desire to take their due part in the conduct of the external affairs of the Commonwealth. No sensible man who believes in imperial federation cares for the machinery of federation for its own sake. Federation is a means not an end, and the end is the creation of a sense of Commonwealth citizenship wider and deeper than the nationalism of its various component parts. The British Commonwealth will not be truly a commonwealth and will not be playing its full part in the evolution of human liberty until the Englishman and the Canadian and the Indian have learned to put the ideals and interests which they have in common before the separate and divergent traditions and interests of their several communities. It is because the British Commonwealth is the school of a wide and liberal citizenship that the advocates of imperial federation place their hopes for human liberty in its future. The organization of the British Commonwealth presents problems similar in some ways to those which confronted the founders of the American Commonwealth, but far wider and more complex in their scope. Meanwhile nothing could tend to bind the two Commonwealths together more surely than the definite recognition that the strange experiments in government which has hitherto been called the British

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Empire has consciously adopted for the ground work of its future policy the same ideals of liberty and responsible government as lie at the base of the fabric of the American Commonwealth.

ALFRED A. ZIMMERN.

London, May.

Billy Sunday and the Historian

ONE might imagine a historian in the perspective of fifty or seventy-five years making a record something like this:

During the second decade of the twentieth century there appeared in the United States a preacher of amazing popularity. He was of that type who set the popular chords moving in staccatos. In passing judgment upon such their contemporaries must shout. They get vitriolic attack or sublimated adulation. Both friends and enemies talk about them in superlatives.

This preacher was the "Peter the Hermit" of his age, though his crusade had not the concrete objectives of that of his semi-apochryphal mediæval prototype. In many personal characteristics and most of their methods the two were as unlike as might well be. But the movements they promoted were strikingly alike in being fervidly religious, in being immensely popular, in giving enormous significance to ideas not essentially weighty, and in hastening large and constructive social ends undesigned by the promoters.

Such a career as his would have been impossible apart from the peculiar religious conditions then prevailing in American society. His extraordinary dramatic and organizing genius found a field prepared for just his combination of technical powers. For two or three decades powerful influences had been awakening the public conscience and generating a profound religious consciousness. But in the meantime the larger religious organizations had stagnated, and their direction had in large part fallen into the power of reactionary forces whence no popular machinery existed to release it. Subtle intolerance had tended to crowd out progressive elements from immediate relations with organized forms of religion. Those progressives who persisted in their allegiance felt keenly the reactionary repressions. Billy Sunday broke a hole through the casings. He caused an explosion, was an explosion, though with no clearly defined, constructive purpose. In the commotion certain rigid forms were shattered; certain traditional bondage was broken.

The organized church as he found it had been roundly abused by many a speaker and writer of the time. By none was it more roughly used than by him. Yet he offered no substitute, no program of reform, advocated no policy designed to do away with the conditions which many well understood to be impossible. In one breath he would rebuke the ministers and churches for not "getting together," and in the next would magnify alleged divine sanctions of the denominational system by which the religious forces of the time were scandalously rent asunder. "God loves variety," was his defense of the system. A sort of despair seems to have gained him a large proportion of his support among orthodox religious leaders. He offered at least a fleeting relief from the flatness and stagnation of the state into which irresponsible reactionary forces had brought the religious organization of the day. And such relief was all the more eagerly accepted because of the type of theology which he preached. Here was but a straw, many of his supporters felt and some frankly acknowledged, but it was at least a straw and the more welcome that it had the color and odor of familiar theological grainfields.

This despair was the more clearly revealed in that hundreds of ministers of recognized culture and refinement heard themselves as a class referred to as "stiffs" and "mutts" and other such sorry baggage, and smilingly pretended to enjoy it. This attitude betokened despair over prevalent religious conditions more reasonably than it gave evidence of the extreme humility which would have been required to endure such ratings with grace.

The popular conscience had long since ceased to satisfy its religious cravings with theological controversy. Yet the constituted religious system continued to make much of theological tests. Heresy was still an ecclesiastical crime, or at least a misdemeanor, for which many dearly paid. Billy Sunday came preaching in the most lurid imagery a theology of a highly reactionary type which was cordially repudiated even by many ministers who supported him, and which meant little or nothing to the multitudes on the benches of his tabernacles. Large numbers of college and university trained men helped to compose his audiences, whose elementary scientific and philosophical culture made agreement with such doctrines out of the question. Yet they overlooked the theology, forgot it, laughed at it, said it did not count anyway, and eagerly went again to hear and see more—for seeing was quite as important as hearing at the Sunday meetings. Nothing could have more effectively demonstrated the slight account which the popular mind accorded to religious dogma under any label than this disregard of the impossible theology which Billy Sunday's sermons display.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But perhaps the most instructive revelation made by this preaching was its lack of insight upon the social reconstruction which was even then in progress. His preaching was among the last outbursts of an extremely individualistic type of evangelism prevalent then and during a period preceding—an outburst the more vehement and dramatic that the movement was so near exhaustion. One discriminating contemporaneous historian compared this method with those against which Martin Luther fulminated in his day, and drew a parallel between Tetzel's sale of "indulgences" and the exemptions from social obligation which this type of evangelism logically supplied. At any rate the social note in religion, which was at that time being bravely struck by some enlightened and forward-looking ministers, was lacking in Billy Sunday's preaching. He preached with great emphasis the personal virtues, and many a man and woman became under his influence a new creature in his home and among his personal friends. He also inveighed against drunkenness and the liquor traffic with such vigor and success that he was probably the best hated man of his day among the distillers and brewers. But the larger, subtler social problems were quite out of his range. Rather, that type of evangelism seemed to cultivate a neglect of social obligation which otherwise might have been expected to inspire the religious-minded. Within a few months following his campaign in the city where he probably won the greatest triumph of his career the municipality at a popular election was turned over to one of the most mercenary and corrupt political gangs then known.

Billy Sunday was a great favorite among certain men of large wealth, numbers of whom had little or no social vision, nor were they rendered by his preaching appreciably more devoted to those larger reconstructions of the industrial order which were already being won at great strain by democratic forces. In short, it was possible to be deeply stirred and powerfully attracted by this type of evangelism while remaining cold or positively opposed to those immensely significant social movements whose success was at that time manifestly delayed by the indifference of religious forces in American life.

This remarkable career was thus a revelation. That was Billy Sunday's service of unique value to his age. He showed where the religious order had broken down. He did not destroy the old nor did he build a new. His effort so far as it was in any sense constructive was to restore and revamp the old. In this he could not in the nature of the case succeed. He did not even attempt building into a new order. But as a revelation of the deficiencies and decay of religious forms he was incomparable. Thus in a peculiar sense events created him. At the same time he was one of the harbingers of a new day. The very brilliance of his effort to reinstate outworn aims and conceptions illuminated the path to new religious goals. Without his intending it, and largely against his desire, the social movement in religion gained a great impetus. To the leaders of that movement themselves were revealed the inadequacies and misdirections of the purely individualistic salvation which conventional religion had for the most part been content to preach, inadequacies and misdirections of which they had long been conscious, but which this display brought out in stark demonstration. To the popular consciousness the experience was not less wholesome when the reaction set in. Nothing could permanently conceal the shallowness of such religious doctrines and programs. The way was thus opened for that thrilling development of the community conscience in religion and the religious sense in community affairs which—

But the bona fide historian must complete the record. A groundling of to-day must not usurp too far the office of prophet.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

A Peace-Lover's War-Epic

ON registration day I read again those passages of Specimen Days in which our greatest poet of democracy has described the scenes and sympathies of his quiet work during the war.

A profound source of his poetry and truth, this story of Whitman's experience has always especially interested me. Besides, it provided the best spiritual preparation I know for a non-registering woman citizen in the ranks to make in the morning before the meeting of the Illinois Division of the Women's and Children's Department of the National Defense, in the afternoon. It was a cool and showery day in Chicago—a "good growing day" for our city garden. Across the street, through the light-budded green of the tree-tops, a bugle sounded, and the colors of two flags, draped at an alley-way, announced the place of enrollment in the midst of our city boulevard neighborhood of specialty stores, of family hotels and balconied apartment-buildings, in the "largest residence-ward."

An occasional voter went into the place of registration; and otherwise our part of the world moved to its ordinary tempo of passing go-carts, of whizzing motors and the traffic policeman's whistle. Only the unusual tightness of the belts of boy-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scouts—the smaller the scout, the tighter his belt—and their proud demeanor as they moved about with young civilian friends, gave any tangible evidence to the public that now its democracy was to be especially well protected.

How very different life is from language. So this was the first process of "conscription." The gravity of the city's sense of national service lay underneath her every-day mien. Yelling about war has never been sympathetic to Americans. Our most familiar traditions of war are none of them conceived in the spirit of a screaming glorification of victory. The embattled farmers at Concord Bridge, Washington's winter-quarters at Valley Forge, Grant and the stupendous war on the Mississippi—all these scenes and persons are characterized by something plain, something homely and almost plodding, something with a magnificence beyond all noise and trappings. There is nothing that triumphs with a lifted bayonet, no glancing helmet, no self-satisfied glint of conquest in the look of our great leaders. The veil of stilled sadness over Washington's face, the heavy gravity of Grant's brave, impassive countenance, the profoundly shadowed melancholy of Lincoln's—in all of these I think there lives with the understanding of human tragedy the calm and settled courage that could uphold a nation through the pain and loss, the daily wear-and-tear of a long, desperate struggle.

Whitman's prose and poetry are especially valuable to us now, because he describes with infinite tact that daily wear-and-tear of the struggle of war; because he never loses sight of the purpose of democracy for which we have entered into war; and because the quality of our national character remains for him "of more significance even than the political interests involved."

Of no sectarian faith, Whitman came of Quaker stock, and did not bear arms. Remarkably strong and robust at thirty-six at the beginning of the war, he left it at the close with his health broken for life from overwork in his national service in the Washington hospitals and with the wounded at the front.

> During those three years in hospital, camp or field, I made over six hundred visits or tours, and went, as I estimate, counting all, among from eighty thousand to a hundred thousand of the wounded and sick, as sustainer of spirit and body, in some degree, in time of need. These visits varied from an hour or two to all day or night; for with dear or critical cases I generally watch'd all night. Sometimes I took up my quarters in the hospital, and slept or watch'd there several nights in succession. Those three years I consider the greatest privilege and satisfaction (with all their feverish excitements and physical deprivations and lamentable sights), and, of course, the most profound lesson of my life. I can say that in my ministerings I comprehended all, whoever came in my way, Northern or Southern, and slighted none. It arous'd and brought out and decided undream'd-of depths of emotion. It has given me my most fervent views of the true *ensemble* and extent of the *States*.

With Whitman this service—the greatest privilege and satisfaction of his life—kept the consecration of a rite. Finding that it was "in the simple matter of personal presence" that he helped most, he was at pains to be at this best and freshest for the visits; would rest and bathe beforehand and fortify himself he says "with clean clothes, a good meal, and as cheerful an appearance as possible." Certainly no genius was ever more fully conscious than Whitman was of his own value or more deeply impressed with a well founded belief that his poetry would be immortal. But his generosity and freedom in giving himself and all his powers to the needs of the ranks of the sick and wounded is equaled only by the humility and modest thoughtfulness of his approach to them.

Engaged in the care literally of myriads of common soldiers, he never adopts wholesale methods. He never is perfunctory. His keen sense of individual requirements is never blunted by numbers. "In one bed a young man, Marcus Small, Company K, 7th Maine—sick with dysentery and typhoid fever—pretty critical case—I talk with him often—he thinks he will die—looks like it indeed. I write a letter for him home to East Livermore, Maine—I let him talk to me a little but not much, advise him to keep very quiet—do most of the talking myself—stay quite a while with him, as he holds on to my hand—talk to him in a cheering, but slow, low and measured manner—talk about his furlough, and going home as soon as he is able to travel."

Then besides these homely friendlinesses; and the poet's success in obtaining "good, home-made rice puddings" from ladies in Washington; and the strange appearance of the Patent Office with the beds of wounded in between the enormous cases of models—we read of agony bravely borne; appreciative, picturesque sketches of the soul, of the look of various companions; the lonely passion of the private soon to die who returns Whitman's good-night kiss, four-fold; the voices of the convalescent soldiers and nurses rising pleasantly to the white-washed, barracks-roof on Sunday afternoon, as they stand singing, "My days are swiftly gliding by, and I a pilgrim stranger," the characteristic sight of Lincoln's worn features on his daily drive from the White House; the wild horror of the terrible, moonlit night-battle in the forest, at Chancellorsville; the wounded burned alive; the flaming timber; the cannon-roar, the crashing on-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

set of the troops; the tranquil splendor of the moon, "the red life-blood oozing out from heads or trunks or limbs upon that green and dew-cool grass."

Tremendous as a poetic record of human character, the power of friendship and grief unassuageable, the wide course of the "old, peerless, passionate, great cause," Specimen Days is more valuable to us as the tale of an art of service adjusted with insight. Its wisdom and its sense of large issues should be known to all those patriotic women who are practising rifle-shooting and those who have determined to knit woolen-garments whether the quarter-master wants them or not.

Life is different from language, and from journalistic expectation. On the morning of the sixth of June we learned that there had been no "rioting against conscription" in Chicago. Our registration day in the second city of the Western World ended under the enfolding veil of one of the most beautiful lake-mists Chicago has ever seen. The enrollment continued after midnight, and until we turned to watch other days "rise from their fathomless deeps."

EDITH WYATT.

Richesse Oblige

MR. PRESIDENT and Gentlemen: There aren't any reporters with us tonight, thank God. That leaves each of us free to say whatever he likes. It leaves me free to say to our funny toastmaster that he is making a big mistake when he refers to this gathering as the Society of Protective Plutocrats. In one sense we are plutocrats. We are all more or less rich. All of us are either successful or else had successful fathers. We have property to defend against the demagogues who are trying to take it away from us. That is all true, but I don't see the point of calling us Protective Plutocrats. This thing is far too serious to joke about. We men who have property are being put more and more on the defensive in this country. People seem to have forgotten that in us they have the strongest possible proof that America is the land of opportunity for industry and thrift.

Let me tell you an experience I had the other day. I had been in the west, looking over a little property out there that I inherited from my good father. On the limited from Chicago I got talking with a man of about my own age. He too was on his way back from the west where he had been inspecting a mine he had been asked to reorganize. Before long it came out that we had been in the same class at college, where, of course, he had known me by sight and by name. But for the life of me I couldn't remember ever having seen or heard of him before in my life. At college he had been a grind. He had belonged to what they call the submerged tenth, though if you ask me I think seven or eight or even nine-tenths would be nearer the mark. Naturally I didn't ask him such an embarrassing question, but for all I know he may have belonged to the Y. M. C. A. Yet to-day that man not only feels as we do about income taxes and labor questions, he looks and acts and talks just like one of us. He is one of us. When another man we met on the train, a very third-rate sort, actually showed us his wife's picture, my old classmate was every bit as surprised as I.

A career like that ought to be an inspiration to every boy in the United States. It used to be in the good old days. It never will be again unless we are prepared to fight for our rights after this war. You gentlemen all know what I am alluding to—To the graduated tax on incomes. People tell us this tax is a war measure, and to a certain extent that is true. But it would never have been thought of if there were not a lot of men in this country, all the down-and-outers and the uplifters, who believe or pretend to believe we have got more than our share of this country's wealth. They forget that what we have got we created. For them the war is merely a pretext. They have the sort of patriotism which doesn't shrink from the expenditure of any amount of money that isn't theirs. Their object is to take away from us in time of war what they intend us never to get back in time of peace. The public need is their opportunity to change the good old system of distributing property, a system, gentlemen, which gave the biggest share to the biggest brains and the biggest effort, and under which this country grew to be that ideal which we are all of us ready to fight for and die for. Scratch the income tax and you find social revolution.

The question for us is what we are going to do about it. And the answer as I see it is plain. This time we are going to do nothing at all. It is too late. But we must look ahead, we must keep our eyes on the future, we must be ready next time. We must make a record in this war. We must prove that there are no better patriots in the United States than the men who have been sneered at as plutocrats. The way to prove this is the way so many of us have taken—by volunteering. Every man of military age who is physically fit, and whose capital is large enough for his wife and children to live on what the demagogues leave of his income, every man who answers this description ought to volunteer.

Volunteering is our tradition. At the schools we went to we didn't sit round with our hands in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our pockets waiting for somebody to put us on one of the school teams by drawing our names out of a hat. We tried our damnedest to make the crew or the eleven or the nine. We volunteered. We were taught to volunteer. And I believe everybody here will agree with me when I say that we were also taught physical courage—not to be afraid of being tackled hard, not to back away from the plate when we faced a pitcher whose control was so poor that he was likely to bean us, not to be spike-shy if we played second or short or third. Don't misunderstand me, gentlemen. Courage is not the exclusive possession of any one class. Even after all these years of arbitration treaties and all the rest of the pacifist twaddle there are brave men all over the United States, even though they have not had our advantages. We ought to be brave. No other class has been taught courage for so many years, six at school and four at college, by such competent teachers. All I ask is that we seize this God-given, war-given opportunity to show that we have learned our lesson, that we are at least as ready to get wounded or killed as any other class in this country.

People are fond of saying nowadays that talk about military glory is hot air, that the conditions of war have changed. Perhaps they have. I can tell you more about that in a few months. But one condition has not changed. In this war, as in every other war that was ever fought anywhere in God's green earth, or on the seas, a liking for danger is a mighty useful thing for a soldier. Gentlemen, we have been taught to like danger. Why do you suppose men and women hunt? Would they enjoy it half as much if they ran no risk of breaking their necks taking a fence? Would shooting rapids, ugly rapids I mean, be half the fun it is if there were any way of playing the game quite safe? The danger you run into in war is not all to the bad, not by a long chalk.

One word more. This time our incomes are going to be conscripted. We can't help ourselves. But when the war is over, when we have shown the whole country what stuff we are made of, let us go to Congress and ask it to let us have what is our own. And if there ever should be another war, which God forbid, let us say what we shall be in a position to say: "We are a class of volunteers. We have proved it. But we value the privilege of volunteering as highly for our incomes as for our bodies. And it is a privilege we know how to use. Did any class in this or any other country ever give on such a stupendous scale as we plutocrats gave to the Red Cross? In exchange for the sacrifices we made in 1917 and are ready to repeat now, we ask you to let the men who volunteer pay a volunteer income tax, and to confine conscription of income to the incomes of men whose bodies have to be conscripted." That is my programme for the future defense of our rights as a class, gentlemen, and I ask you whether anything could be fairer?

CORRESPONDENCE

Good Citizenship in War

SIR: Since presiding at a mass meeting in Chicago, called for the purpose of representing the opinion of many citizens that the government should take the lead in formulating terms of peace, I have received so many letters with reference to my position, both from people who approved and those who condemned, and in particular from those who misunderstood, that I am asking the use of your columns to make a personal explanation. I recognize that my views as a private citizen are unimportant. I have reason to know, however, that they are shared by many others, who have not had the same reason for expressing them as I have.

1. In the first place, I am not a pacifist. I believe thoroughly, however, that the present war on the part of the United States is a war for peace. I understand this from a reading of all President Wilson's utterances to Congress, none of which he has withdrawn and some of which he has distinctly re-affirmed. I am not at present concerned with the questions whether we had sufficient cause to engage in a punitive war, or sufficient reason, in the law of self-preservation, to enter a military and financial combination with other nations involving territorial aims which are not primarily ours. I believe that our government is in honor bound to the nation which elected it to maintain the war on the highest ground as a national war for world peace. This is not only a matter of honor—it is further a matter of urgent public policy. Only on this ground, in the long run, can this war be made acceptable in a democracy such as ours, and continue to inspire the people to the necessary sacrifice. I, therefore, believe that the discussion of peace as the object of the war, and the definition of such terms as will make this object the end of the war, and possibly the end of all war, are wise and patriotic. It is needless to say that I do not sympathize with any attempt to hamper the government in enforcing measures duly taken under law for carrying on the war—such as conscription, taxation, loans, control of food and prices, etc. I do not believe that the way to universal peace lies in the direction of a German victory.

2. I am not a "conscientious objector." I am quite willing to concede that in this matter I live on a lower moral plane than many whom I profoundly respect and admire. My atrophied conscience would not justify me in refusing any service to the government which I could render. But I feel that it is in the spirit of *noblesse oblige* on the part of such tough-minded people as myself to protect so far as may be the scruples of others. I believe that the war can be fought effectively only by those who are physically and morally ready to fight—that just as in the process of conscription many will be exempt from war service for physical reasons, so others should be exempt for moral reasons. And I believe that such exemption should in neither case be made a subject of persecution or ignominy. I believe that this course is the way of honor and also the way of wisdom.

3. While I am a democrat, hitherto I have merely ac-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cepted democracy as the order of things under which I was born, and I have seen probably more to criticize than to applaud in it. But I am resolutely opposed to changing that order of things under stress of war. It has been the usual course of democracy in a struggle for existence to transform itself into autocracy. Obviously tendencies in this direction are appearing in our own state. If I were sure that our government could, by the use of the force at its command, bring about peace within a few weeks or months I should be less concerned at such tendencies. They might be passed by as merely incidental, and, as they often are, accidental. But suppose the war goes on another year. The United States cannot, as England has done, transform its government constitutionally by a coalition ministry and deferred election of Parliament into a permanent committee of public safety. Our rigid system prescribes national elections every two years. I, therefore, feel that it is a matter of the highest statesmanship on the part of our government to remain responsive to the system of democratic control to which it owes its existence; for only in this way can it claim to be truly representative. And surely it is a matter of honor as well as policy to keep faith with the American people, to whom that government must look for increasing support and sacrifice.

4. Especially I feel it the part of good citizenship to protest against the unauthorized and sometimes illegal action of individuals who conceive that by violent interference with human or constitutional rights they are fulfilling a patriotic duty. The action of a prominent citizen of Chicago the other day who caused the arrest of three men—two of them neutral aliens—for remaining seated during a performance of a national song, the action of the judge in publicly scolding these men who had suffered a night of illegal imprisonment, and the action of other citizens leading to the dismissal of the two aliens from their positions and their blacklisting—all this, I say, seems to me wilfully and stupidly unpatriotic. The action of soldiers in the service of the nation or of the several states in interfering with the right of citizens to assemble peaceably and go about their business legally seems to me a betrayal of the flag under which those soldiers serve. Some days ago a soldier shot and killed a saloonkeeper in New Jersey for obeying the law which forbade him to sell or give liquor to men in uniform. This seems to me a graver dereliction from duty than the classic offense of the sentry who sleeps at his post—for which offense he is proverbially shot. It belongs to society and to the press, especially to those elements which are most strongly imbued with a sense of the righteousness of the war, to deal with the first kind of fake patriotism. It belongs to government, national, state or local, to deal with the second.

There are several qualities which are earnestly to be cultivated in the interest of national unity at such a time as this. The first of them is confidence. The people must trust each other as citizens and trust the government; but, on the other hand, the government should set an example by trusting the people. The efficient national secret service and the loyal newspapers which daily confront us with discoveries of German plots might consider whether public welfare at this time is not to be served rather by discretion than by exaggeration. The second is frankness. The government should give no cause for suspicion that its purposes are subject to reservation and concealment. Even in foreign relations President Wilson has committed himself to "open diplomacy." And, on the other hand, I venture to think it an obligation resting on citizenship for the people to be frank with the government—open and above board in expressing their desires and views. And to this end I believe it their patriotic duty to be especially zealous of any infringement of the right of freedom of speech. And finally there is tact—tact as between citizen and citizen, tact as between press and government on the one hand and individuals on the other. The good citizen will exercise reserve in flinging such epithets as disloyal and traitorous at his fellow from whom he differs in opinion. The government and press should recognize the terrific strain, moral and physical, which this people is undergoing. They should be cautious in qualifying hesitation, question, even criticism as treason: and instead of exaggerating the offense of those who are in honest opposition to the dominant tendency, even as expressed by law, they will treat such cases with sympathetic understanding.

Now, at the beginning of this war, we have an opportunity to establish such standards of social and human tolerance as will in the end make of our country not only a stronger, but a wiser, and, in the human sense, a richer nation: we have an opportunity to insure something in the way of spiritual inheritance which within our own borders will be in some sort a compensation for the monstrous losses of war—and which cannot fail to be a part of our contribution to the new law of nations, and the new world system, to which it is our sustaining faith to look forward.

ROBERT MORSE LOVETT.

Chicago, Illinois.

Japanese Lose Hope for Germany

SIR: Assuming that it is not a ruse designed to be carried out in collusion with the German high command and for the ultimate success of the German cause, the late move by which Japanese forces have been sent into European waters in support of the Entente is the most sinister and convincing episode of the warlike situation in Europe since the failure of the assault on Verdun. Sinister, that is to say, as seen from the German point of view. Assuming always, as has just been said, that it is not a ruse undertaken by Oriental statecraft in collusion with the quasi-Oriental statecraft of Berlin, it plainly signifies that the statesmen of the Far-Eastern empire have cast up the account to date and have concluded that there is no gain to be had for Imperial Japan by further playing fast and loose with the European belligerents and keeping open a chance of alliance with Imperial Germany at the close of hostilities or at any opportune stage in their further prosecution. The statesmen of Imperial Japan have evidently reached the conviction that the chances of ulterior gain for Japan by eventual use of an offensive alliance with Germany are no longer worth serious attention, as against the certainty of a hostile attitude on the part of the nations of the Entente toward any further schemes of Japanese aggrandizement.

Seen in the long and dispassionate perspective afforded by the Far-Eastern point of view, and rated quite unemotionally in terms of prospective profit and loss to the imperial establishment, the European war situation will necessarily present itself as a large question of "alternative uses." It has long been evident that the conservative, that is to say imperialistic and reactionary, statesmen who have controlled the policies of Japan have consistently taken thought to avoid any avoidable offense as against Germany. It is similarly evident that a shrewd imperial policy, whenever a propitious conjuncture may arise, should negotiate a close alliance with Germany and her follow-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing for the purpose of making whatever gains might be made during the period of weakness and disorganization that is expected to take effect among the Entente nations on the close of the present hostilities. But such a policy presumes that the German Empire is to come out of its present difficulties substantially intact; intact, at least, to the extent of still doing business as a German Empire under the rule and policies of the Prussian statesmen. The present move of the Japanese forces would seem to signify that these shrewdest, most callous, and most watchful of all adepts in unashamed statecraft have decided that the chances of so fortunate an eventuality for the German imperial forces are now too slight to be worth serious consideration. It would signify, in other words, that in the apprehension of the Japanese imperial statesmen the German Empire is not to appear on the map of Europe as it is to be redrawn for the day after tomorrow; and it would signify also that in their apprehension there is no help for this sinister eventuality, even if the forces of imperial Japan were to be thrown in unreservedly on the side of the German Empire and its allies. The surmise also suggests itself that it may be America's entrance into the war that so has given the outcome in this Japanese computation of "alternative uses."

THORSTEIN VEBLEN.

University of Missouri.

Washington Explains

SIR: After citing the discrepancies in the army registration of Pacific Coast states, you asked editorially, June 16th, "Why was the error so much greater in Oregon and Washington than in California?"

Washington's registration was 50.9 per cent of the estimate provided by the census bureau, you report. This charges the state with the possession of 100,000 slackers. Oregon registered 57.9 per cent and California 81.8 per cent.

From 1900 to 1910 the populations of California gained 60 per cent, Oregon 62 per cent and Washington 121 per cent. Evidently the census bureau did not consult local authorities in finding its 1917 figures but applied a mechanical scale of growth based on the 1909-10 increases. It credited Washington with a population gain of 60 per cent in the last seven years and California with a gain of 25 per cent.

Washington makes no claim to such a growth since 1910. During this period California has held its expositions and has experienced a phenomenal urban and agricultural expansion.

Furthermore, to place a still larger responsibility on Washington's young men, the census bureau placed the state in the frontier classification, declaring that 13.6 per cent of its male population is between the ages of 21 and 31. I have been unable to learn what percentage it applied to California, but for Texas it figured that only 6.9 per cent of its male population is of selective draft age.

Washington is no more a frontier state in the make-up of its population than many middle western states. The census figures in 1910 credited three of its cities with a total population of 425,339 or 38 per cent of the state's people.

Although local chambers of commerce have been delighted from time to time to point to the census bureau's annual estimates of population, these figures are popular no longer. The state has not 100,000 slackers and if arrests of those not registered are a correct standard, it hasn't more than 100 genuine evaders of the draft law.

CLOUGH D. HUDSON.

Spokane, Washington.

Another Reply

SIR: Professor Lovejoy's communication published in your issue of June 16th appears to me to disregard totally the position of one group of conscientious objectors, and to beg the question between him and the other group.

The first group consists of those who would be willing to fight if they saw good reason for fighting, and who object to fighting in this war simply because they see no such reason. They disapprove not of all wars, but specifically of this war. They particularly object to forced service (which to them is indistinguishable from slavery in its worst form) in a war which Professor Lovejoy claims is a war for freedom.

The second group, to which the communication in question is addressed, bases its position on the doubt whether oppression and violence can be effectually resisted by violence. It is this point which Professor Lovejoy takes for granted. He says that "we very well know" that such liberty as now prevails in the world has been obtained and kept only because men fought and killed for it. Surely Professor Lovejoy should know that this is a wholly undemonstrable proposition, and that it is definitely denied by his opponents in the argument, who include some men not wholly destitute of intelligence (as the late Count Tolstoi and his followers).

This is the whole gist of such argument as Professor Lovejoy offers in his communication. Once there was no liberty in the world. Later there were wars for liberty. Now there is some liberty. Therefore, the world could not possibly have attained this liberty without war—"as we very well know."

A clearer case of the fallacy *post hoc ergo propter hoc* could scarcely be devised.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

VERSE

The History of a Minute

I saw a lady on the stair,
And she was, oh, so strangely fair,
With a knot of butter-colored hair,
And a waiting, listening, wondering air.
She was tall as a lady ought to be,
And down she looked and smiled at me.
Her eyes were queerly brightly blue
As the bit of sky that last shines through
The gathering clouds oppressive gray
On a chilly windy Autumn day.
There she paused on the stairs and smiled
Like a child who sees another child
With whom it would dearly like to play
If it only could get its nurse away.
And I know not what divine surmise
Leapt up like fire in my eyes,
But I know her smiling suddenly stopped,
And a curtain between us blankly dropped,
And she passed me by as if I were
Something invisible to her.

ALICE DUER MILLER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the Capitol

"THERE have been more irrelevant and immaterial subjects discussed during the debate on this food-control bill," said Mr. Blackmon in the House on Thursday, "than I have ever heard before on a measure of similar importance." But though this comment is descriptive, so far as the general run of the discussion goes, it is also true that those who led the debate—Mr. Lever and Mr. Anderson, in the House, and Mr. Kenyon and Mr. Chamberlain in the Senate—had a surer grasp of what was involved than is displayed by the congressman whose argument is ordinarily supplied to him by some departmental official and whose distress when he is asked a question not anticipated in his list of replies is apparent. Advocates of the bill had need, too, of a more than usually adaptable argument; for interpreters of the bill varied from Mr. Meeker—who declared the measure not only without teeth, but "with its gums carefully padded with eiderdown"—to Mr. Campbell, who thought it would be an argument for the German people not to throw over their junkers. There was also a tendency to use the bill as excuse for a gesture of nonpartisanship. Thus, for instance, the Republican support which Mr. Langley proffered to the President: "So far as I am concerned, Democrat though he is, I would rather have him tell me what to eat than have the Kaiser do it. As between Wilson and Wilhelm, I am for Wilson. [Applause.]"

The one clear development of the debate, however, was its disclosure, for the third time within a few weeks, of the shortcomings of the present system of leadership in Congress. Senator Gore, who declared that should the bill be passed he had "not the slightest doubt that the business machinery and business organization of the country would come down in one sudden and irresistible crash," was theoretically the administration spokesman, in his position as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. His handing over of the management of the bill to Senator Chamberlain recalls the action of Senator Stone, who placed the war resolution in the hands of Mr. Hitchcock, and of Representative Dent, whose disagreement forced the administration to rely upon Republican leadership for the conscription bill. Foreign policy, an army, food-control—certainly these are the three important adjuncts of a war; and in each case either a House or a Senate chairman has not only been unwilling to support the administration program, but has fought it with the full force of his prestige. It is not that the war has substituted new conditions. It has simply disclosed old ones at a time when impatience has attracted public attention.

The disadvantage is not in the loss of an individual leader; ranking members, and even members of the opposition, have frequently taken the same material, furnished by an executive office, and made as effective exposition from it. The difficulty is rather in the fact that each house turns naturally to the only form of leadership it has, and a dissenting chairman, submitting a minority report, disintegrates what limited unity there is. The initiative has come to be expected from the committee, and scarcely at all from the house itself. Thus Mr. Webb, in trying to cut short the debate on the Espionage bill when that measure was before the House, declared, "I want to say that we have been debating this bill in committee for two months, and we have debated it in the House for two days." The irony of his inference escaped him. Of course, with the present organization of Congress, the major part of the work must be done in committee; but there was substance in Mr. Mann's remark that "The fact that it took two months for twenty-one gentlemen to express their sentiments to one another is of itself a suggestion that four hundred and thirty-two members ought to have more than two hours."

The difficulty is that the administration cannot place its plans before Congress through recognized spokesmen, but must depend upon leaders in Congress whose coöperation, if indeed it is coöperation, is entirely the result of good fortune. It is interesting that the weaknesses of a complete separation of powers have been so well revealed in the discussion of war measures that the plan has been revived, this time in a bill introduced on Monday by Senator McLean, of providing heads of departments and chairmen of commissions with seats in both houses and the privilege of participating in debate. The possible results of open and responsible collaboration of those who make the law with those who are to administer it has received considerable attention; a bill almost identical with Mr. McLean's was introduced in 1881, and since that time the matter has been coming up and receiving indifferent consideration periodically. Apparently the frequent failures of the present system have not weakened confidence in the theoretical separation of powers; on this occasion the conventional distrust in anything making for a closer union of the two branches of government was expressed by Senator Borah, who moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, because he "did not assume that the American people will ever favor such a proposition until these officials [the Cabinet members and the Commission chairmen] are elected to office." And yet, on the following day, Mr. Emerson stated in the House that he was just beginning to realize "how little Congress would do if it were not for the constant prodding of the President." It would be quite as much for its own protection as through any desire for reform if Congress, by adopting some form of Mr. McLean's plan, should legalize the collaboration that is now going on every day, and give regularity to the "executive usurpation" which is causing the older members particularly so much unnecessary distress.

Nevertheless, there is one incident of the past week unusually significant in the matter of organization. On Tuesday, when an exceptionally earnest discussion arose in the Senate as to what Mr. Hoover meant by a part of his testimony before the committee, it occurred to those in charge of the debate that it would be a wise plan to ask Mr. Hoover himself. Accordingly, Mr. Chamberlain moved that the Senate take a recess until the next day at twelve in order to give the senators an opportunity to be present to hear the statement of Mr. Hoover. The direct gain that resulted from agreeing to this motion was of course negligible. Doubtless, whether or not it had been agreed to, the attendance of the Senate would have dropped to its customary twenty, while the majority of members attended the hearing. But that the recess was taken for the express purpose of learning from an administrative official his views of a pending measure was unusual. It was, in a way, a concession for which Mr. Hoover's prestige was responsible. But it was also the indication of a sincere desire for a better partnership, regardless of what customary procedure held to the contrary. A unified effort on the part of a few responsible leaders in Congress could break down this barrier to better government, and others, that have seemed almost unassailable when the country was not at war.

C. M.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Things

AT this rate the anonymous author of Graggles will never have done with his hero's story. In a first volume, which was reviewed here about two years ago, Graggles reached the age of eight or nine. He appears to be seventeen, or not much more, at the end of this new volume. What the author offers us this time, chronologically, planlessly, is chiefly an account of Graggles's reading, though we see here and there first-beginnings of his two other main interests, in landscape and persons. Imagine a boy of ten, which seems to have been a bow and arrow age in that bow and arrow epoch, stopping in his play every now and then of a lonely summer morning, and sitting down on the steps of a long western porch, where his sister was sewing and his mother reading aloud. His mother was an undramatic, low-relief reader, who interrupted herself occasionally by laughing. One gets a notion that after this fashion, during a summer or two, Graggles heard many fragments of Miss Austen. At first he understood nothing. He began by taking quite seriously Mr. Bennet's remark that Wickham, perhaps, was his favorite son-in-law, nor could he appreciate Marianne Dashwood's feelings when Sir John Middleton, of whom she had asked what were Willoughby's pursuits, his talents and genius, made this reply: "Upon my soul, I do not know much about him as to all *that*. But he is a pleasant, good-humored fellow, and has got the nicest little black bitch of a pointer I ever saw. Was she out with him today?" Several years later Graggles was moved to find out for himself what these stories were like, each of which he had heard parts of and none as a whole. What he got from them at that time was encouragement in his habit of seeing the comic side first in all the human beings he met, excepting boys who were better at games than he. Later still he saw for himself the other comedy in Miss Austen, the mistakes of persons who are comic only when self-deceived. The author tells us Graggles was much older than he grows in this volume before he noticed the unwisdom of letting perception of the comic do duty for understanding.

On a sea voyage, recorded in the earlier volume, Graggles had looked at the sea. When he was twelve years old, and was spending a month on a farm in the New Hampshire hills, he first looked at landscape with anything like a spectator's eye. If the sounding cataract did not haunt him like a passion, neither did it wholly fail to please. Playing on the ledges in the bed of a modest river, he would pause to watch the water thin itself on the rocks, or look at the waterfall upstream, and wonder why his mother could not tell him the difference between waterfall, cataract and cascade. His interest in things was always dimmed by his interest in words, especially after a stranger, a cross-country walker, had stayed for a couple of nights at the farm, and told Graggles that a cataract fell down all the way in one vertical plunge. The stranger had other wonderful things to say. He taught Graggles that the sky was worth watching at other times than sunset, taught him to tell the clouds apart, and to give them exciting names, such as anvil cloud, shower cloud, heap cloud, turret cloud. This namer and explainer of things affirmed that there were seasons in the sky. Then he went his way, saying New England wouldn't be a bad place for a walk if its beds were as hard as its doughnuts and its doughnuts as fluffy as its feather-beds. His visit gave Graggles new eyes for several things, and incited him to hunt for words with which to describe the sober and surprising performances of the far hills, when you were taking a long drive, and one hill would leave its own group and float solidly away to join a group of foreigners. No words but these, however, could he find, and they were not satisfactory. He could find no words at all for the storms, neither when he patiently watched perpendicular rains move across the face of the hills, nor when he was dazzled by forked lightning's ardent zigzag.

Graggles's first adventure as a reader befell him on a journey, which he took when he was sixteen, without his mother or sister, at the instigation of friends. He was prepared for this adventure by his bringing up in an orthodox household, where "sceptic" was a word of fear. So when he found in a Montreal book shop a copy of Representative Men, and observed that one of the essays was called Montaigne, or the Sceptic, he bought the cheap reprint and carried it to his hotel in a trembling hand. That evening he hurried through the essay. He could not grasp much of it, but one thing was clear: Mr. Emerson, whose name he had been used to hear spoken with respect, who did not keep low company, but lived in Concord, Massachusetts, not above fifty miles from Graggles's own birthplace, this Mr. Emerson indisputably believed not only that a sceptic might be a great and good man, but that scepticism itself might be all right. And the first of these beliefs was manifestly sound. The essay proved Montaigne, of whom Graggles now heard for the first time, to have been a wonderful man. Foundations shook under Graggles, the ceiling cracked over his head, shafts of light fell upon him out of a high unknown world. Once at home again he began to feel his way, with thrilling precautions, about his mother's mind, came at every turn upon danger signals, and kept his great discovery to himself.

His mother never suspected that he had been weighing her authority in the scales against Emerson's, but not long afterward, when a passion for George Eliot had made Graggles late for many meals, she saw that something must be done to lessen such an influence. Hard to do, this something was, but she did it. She called Graggles into the library one evening, shut both doors, and broke the news: George Eliot had lived for years with a man she wasn't married to, in violation of laws human and divine. His mother hated to tell him this, and would have hated it still more had she comprehended the effect of her communication. For Graggles, grown wary, betrayed himself by no sign, but took the news off and examined it. He loved his mother, but George Eliot's was the better mind. If George Eliot didn't think marriage indispensable, what was he to think of unmarried love? Gigantic, colored, liberating inferences began to take shape on the horizon of his mind. But before long the episode and its implications had paled in the light of a fresh discovery, that there was something in this world called poetry, that there were men who could put you on magic carpets, woven of rhythms and other musics, and take you to marvellous places in no time, poets whose ease had wings and whose exactness was glowing. For a year or more Graggles read hardly anything but poetry, finding it more sudden and compressed than prose, more colored and less explicit, more energetic and intimate, quieter and more violent. While he is in the act of transferring his attention from poetry to gregarious games the book comes to an end, after having narrated, with a patience a little in excess of the reader's patience, the adventures of a boy among words.

P. L.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another War

IT is over twenty years since Stephen Crane wrote The Red Badge of Courage, an Episode of the Civil War. The book had its hour of fame when it was published, and it is seldom mentioned even now without a strong word of praise. But is it read? It is to be found in second-hand bookstores and on the shelves where some anchored families keep yesterday's novels. It is to be seen in libraries. But has the oncoming generation, the generation that was not yet reading in 1895, any notion of the ardent reality of this story, any notion of its perennial quality?

The era in which Stephen Crane wrote this story of war could hardly think it was "normal" of him to revivify "Greeklike struggles." The word "morbid" was not infrequently applied to him. One can imagine how the figures of William McKinley and Queen Victoria—figures which embody the excellent respectability that also ordained the Morris chair, the horsehair sofa and the bustle—would symbolically have averted themselves, and with them their public, from the quivering vivacity of this American. There was little about the year 1895 to indemnify a passionate youth who had discovered for himself the drama of the Civil War and had lived it over in a marvelous story. The Civil War had gone, the G. A. R. remained, and the United States in the meantime had propagated the Republican party, the yellow newspaper and chewing gum. And, besides, The Red Badge of Courage was not heroic. It was a disclosure of the madness of war, the spirit of Stephen Crane dancing over the phantasmagoric activity of the brave who were no more. Strange as it was for Crane to occupy himself with the red splendors and gray terrors of the generation that had preceded him, it was still more strange of him to look at that day with such bold dissective candor. On both counts there was good cause why The Red Badge of Courage should not have accompanied The Crisis into the great fond American heart.

The popular way to represent men at war is the way of such a British versifier as Doyle:

> Poor, reckless, rude, low-born, untaught,
> Bewildered, and alone,
> A heart, with English instinct fraught,
> He yet can call his own.
> Ay, tear his body limb from limb,
> Bring cord, or axe, or flame:
> He only knows, that not through *him*
> Shall England come to shame. . . .
>
> So, let his name through Europe ring—
> A man of mean estate,
> Who died, as firm as Sparta's King,
> Because his soul was great.

In this sort of doggerel you get nothing more or less than the press-agent account of heroism, written with complete indifference to the reality, but with a ruling intention of promoting patriotism. The absence of any such purposiveness is one thing that makes The Red Badge of Courage so pure and admirable a work of art. Crane had only one object, to render a true account of warfare as he had imaginatively experienced it and as beyond doubt he had recaptured it from the veterans who were the absorbing and glorious idols of his childhood. It did not matter to him whether his account fell in with the purposes of the recruiting sergeant or served the ends of the pacifist. The powerful excitement that the Civil War communicated to his sensitive nature, the fervor with which it inflamed him, sufficed to make him write a book which, while known to be vicarious, was yet out of the heart of reality.

One of the keen pleasures of The Red Badge of Courage is derived from the vividness of Crane's expression. "There could be seen a certain stiffness in the movements of his body, as if he were taking infinite care not to arouse the passion of his wounds." "The youth desired to screech out his grief. He was stabbed, but his tongue lay dead in the tomb of his mouth." These phrases, however, are only the outer leaves of a poetic corolla, and no more give the secret of the story than do petals, one by one, give the secret of the rose. The transition from such images to the plainest colloquialism is part of the magic of this tale, which has crudeness and delicacy, roughness and softness, as near and as apposite as dark leaf and radiant flower. "Yeh know there was a boy killed in my comp'ny t'-day that I thought th' world an' all of. Jack was a nice feller. By ginger, it hurt like thunder t' see ol' Jack jest git knocked flat. We was a-standin' purty peaceable fer a spell, 'though there was men runnin' ev'ry way all 'round us, an' while we was a-standin' like that, 'long came a big fat feller. He began t' peck at Jack's elbow, an' he ses: 'Say, where's th' road t' th' river?' An' Jack, he never paid no attention, an' th' feller kept on a-peckin' at his elbow an' sayin': 'Say, where's th' road t' th' river?' Jack was a-lookin' ahead all th' time tryin' t' see th' Johnnies comin' through th' woods, an' he never paid no attention t' this big fat feller fer a long time, but at last he turned 'round an' he ses: 'Ah, go t' hell an' find th' road t' th' river!' An' jest then a shot slapped him bang on th' side th' head. He was a sergeant, too. Them was his last words. Thunder, I wish we was sure'a findin' our reg'ments t'-night." This is the accent that one misses in the patriotic versifier, the informal and unguarded tone of sincerity.

The youth about whose crisis The Red Badge of Courage is written knows what it is to feel panic, to be a "craven loon." In the first ugly encounter of battle he keeps his nerve, but the second test comes before he is braced for it, and he turns tail. A large part of the book is taken up with his wanderings in the rear of a battle from which his cowardice has excluded him. It is natural for him to plunge into the thick of the woods, out of hearing of the shots he had evaded, but even there he cannot escape his ordeal. "A woodpecker stuck his impudent head around the side of a tree. A bird flew on light-hearted wing.

"Off was the rumble of death. It seemed now that Nature had no ears.

"This landscape gave him assurance. A fair field holding life. It was the religion of peace. It would die if its timid eyes were compelled to see blood. He conceived Nature to be a woman with a deep aversion to tragedy. . . .

"At length he reached a place where the high, arching boughs made a chapel. He softly pushed the green doors aside and entered. Pine needles were a gentle brown carpet. There was a religious half light.

"Near the threshold he stopped, horror-stricken at the sight of a thing.

"He was being looked at by a dead man who was seated with his back against a columnlike tree. The corpse was dressed in a uniform that once had been blue, but was now faded to a melancholy shade of green. The eyes,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

staring at the youth, had changed to a dull hue to be seen on the side of a dead fish. The mouth was open. Its red had changed to an appalling yellow. Over the gray skin of the face ran little ants. One was trundling some sort of a bundle along the upper lip. . . ." Again the youth flies, back within the tentacles of the battle.

Carrying his knowledge of cowardice, the youth has to hide it from the straggling wounded he joins with. Their maundering inquiries infuriate him, and he brutally deserts a tattered old man whose rambling talk turns to delirium. In the dark fields he falls in with soldiers frantically retreating. He angers one of them by trying to stop him for information, is bludgeoned for his persistence, and at last crawls back to his own regiment with a lying account of having been wounded.

The next day comes the attainment of courage, the unselfishness that shakes hands with death. It is a lapse from realism that the youth forgets his clouted head so quickly, but Stephen Crane wishes to knit up as closely as possible the whole drama of a soul in battle. The account of the little fight that brims up the youth with war-experience is perhaps more vivid than anything else in the novel, though such segregated pictures as that of the four southern prisoners excels the account of the battle by reason of the humorous sharpness that marked Crane's appreciation of men. The description of the fighting is almost more rhythmic than is tolerable. It is, in fact, poetry in its scansions. This is a blemish, but one of eager youth, like the delight in pressing against the edge of fear. And the proud, solemn tones at the end of The Red Badge of Courage are compensatory for horror and anguish. Written in depths of peace by one who never saw warfare, they are more valid than most of the pages written in these days in the ink of fresh blood.

F. H.

Governmental Finance

The Financial Administration of Great Britain, by W. F. Willoughby, W. W. Willoughby and S. M. Lindsay. New York: D. Appleton & Co. $2.75.

THIS is an admirably lucid volume which sets a high standard for the series it inaugurates. Few things are more necessary than to bring home to the American people not so much the antique inefficiency of its financial system, that is already tolerably known, as the possibility of its replacement by more adequate and less wasteful methods. The financial system of Great Britain is the ablest in the world. It manages admirably a colossal revenue subject at every turn to parliamentary control. It is checked at every point by officials whose business it is to minimize the waste that has thus far been culpably inherent in democratic government. It is a system which has an integrated purpose that is painfully absent from that of this country. Not merely is it conceived as a whole, but it is conceived as a whole in terms of the general policy of the party in power. It has thus no straggling ends. It is not subject to proposals of itemized increase by private members who have selfish interests to serve. It relates itself vitally to the pressing needs of the time without becoming so elastic as to lose sight of the principles upon which it is founded. Nor is it in any sense a recondite subject. Any one who reads a series of Mr. Gladstone's Budget speeches cannot fail to be impressed by the simplicity and ease with which it works. Here are great financial principles greatly expounded. They are attacked, as they are defended, upon the basis of their underlying assumptions. Whatever may be the faults of the British Parliament it has always understood its Budgets. It has realized that their minute examination has been the pivot of their control. The Commons Committee on Accounts is scrupulous in the exercise of its duties. It realizes that its report is exactly the proof that the will of the people has found expression in the work of the executive. It is, of course, true that much of this system has, except on paper, been scrapped in the course of this war. Hundreds of millions have been voted in debates where the only criticism has been congratulation. Yet the fundamental lines of method remain; and when peace is restored they will resume their ancient function.

The authors of this volume have provided a description of the technique underlying the British system. They describe its fundamental features, the way in which money is estimated, the method in which it is raised, the control of expenditure. One can only say that no better account of their subject exists. It is not, of course, an exciting volume; though it is fully as clear as the subject allows. It is perhaps defective, though the authors admit the presence of this characteristic, in its analysis of the financial system in relation to the House of Commons. It does not, as I think, allow sufficiently for the important fact that much of the success of the system is dependent thereon. When the history of the exchequer in the nineteenth century comes to be written it will be plain that the marks of Mr. Gladstone's peculiar genius are written large upon it. It ought to explain why men who were, on the assumption of office, almost pathetically ignorant of finance, like Mr. Disraeli and Lord Randolph Churchill, could, from the very simplicity of the system, readily become acquainted with its mysteries. It hardly emphasizes sufficiently the immense importance to the success of the system of the confidence of bankers and financiers. The very fact of its simplicity has enabled them to test it at every point; and the influence of financial changes upon the delicate mechanism of credit is reduced to a minimum. Lombard Street took Mr. Lloyd George's famous Budget of 1909 as coolly as a morning bath; the result in Wall Street of such a gay adventure would probably have been a panic. Nor is it unimportant to emphasize the relation of professional economists to the English financial system. Mr. Gladstone, as is well known, had frequent consultation with Bagehot on technical questions; and it was Bagehot who invented the modern Treasury bill. So, in our own day, the Treasury has availed itself of the services of Sir George Paish and Mr. Hartley Withers; and a Lord Chief Justice of England has been its representative in this country.

It is greatly to be hoped that the Institute of Government Research, of which this is the first publication, will realize how essential it is not to allow its work in any degree to be retarded by the war. It announces, for example, a report upon the conditions under which the civil service may be improved, and such a volume is emphatically a work of public importance. The federal government is bound to add thousands of employees to its ranks during the years of war. The multiplication of bureaus has already begun. It is very certain that some, at any rate, of the functions it undertakes, it will continue to perform after peace comes. But the possibilities opened up by such an immense extension of the civil service reveal a wide avenue to the evils of bureaucracy. There is plenty of evidence that England has not escaped those problems.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Anyone who reads the voluminous lists of questions in Parliament will see how badly fundamental institutions like those which deal with the allowances and pensions of soldiers and sailors have functioned. Not a tenth part, even of well informed opinion in England, is aware how those departments are administered. Yet it is only by a relentless publicity that they can be trusted to function with an adequate humanity. There is still time for the Institute of Government Research to set itself the examination of such a task. It would thereby earn the gratitude of everyone who is interested in the process of government.

There is one other question that it is worth while to raise. Studies of this kind may be done in two ways. They may be a simple description of method without regard to its application in actual life. They may attempt, as Bagehot attempted in his incomparable studies, the painting of a living institution in its daily existence. No one will doubt that the second method is by far the most difficult as also that it is but rarely successful. But, at the same time, it is impossible to doubt how supremely valuable such a successful effort can be. The authors of this book will help someone to make administrative history. But it is in their power, if they will discuss their subject dynamically instead of statically, if they will but write it in terms of men, actually to make it themselves. No one, for instance, can doubt that a few paragraphs in Mr. Graham Wallas's note on the Foreign Office in the recent report in England on the Civil Service will be decisive in its history. It needs courage, maybe, to be suggestive. But the function of an institute which aims at discovery by research is to risk its reputation by insisting on the application of its conclusions to the work in hand. This monograph is so excellent in what it gives us that it is difficult not to feel angry that its writers did not tell us all that must have been in their hearts.

H. J. L.

TIFFANY & CO.

SILVER, SUBSTANTIAL IN WEIGHT

FIFTH AVENUE AND 37TH STREET
NEW YORK

"Free-Hand" Architecture

Our Hispanic Southwest, by Ernest Peixotto. Illustrations by the Author. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.

MR. PEIXOTTO approaches New Mexico, to which the greater part of his book is devoted, by way of New Orleans, San Antonio, El Paso and Tucson, Arizona, a route that leads him ever gradually backward in time, and perhaps it is for this reason that his reactions to the more primitive New Mexican architecture seem a little less colored, a little less appreciative than his reactions to the Spanish-American architecture of a later date and a more ornate type. He does full justice to San Xavier del Bac at Tucson, with its almost Oriental, its Saracenic aspect, "the handsomest, the most complete and extensive Spanish mission within the boundaries of the United States"; but this church, although of about the same period, was nearer to old Mexico and to the comparatively trained Mexican or imported Spanish workmen, and so belongs to a type quite distinct from that of the isolated Mexican churches of New Mexico.

Mr. Peixotto's eyes—we know him from his earlier books—are full of the charms of the Hispanic-American architecture of South America or of California. When he laments that the portale of the old Palace of the Governors at Santa Fé was not designed in restoration as a "handsome colonnade such as those one sees in front of any of the Spanish government buildings of Latin America" it is evident that he has failed to note the essential characteristics of New Mexican architecture—the type of architecture in existence in the time of the Spanish governors and extant to-day. This architecture is based upon the Indian pueblo, in structure and in material, and its unit is, very simply, the cube. The straight line prevails, and the round arch is seldom, almost never, used. The Latin American style of colonnade, with curved arches, would have been distinctly out of place on this old pueblo palace.

One emphasizes this subject, because these old buildings in New Mexico have not only a religious or historic significance; they are beautiful in themselves and they represent perhaps the most truly indigenous architecture in this country, and they are capable of providing the germinal inspiration for a new architectural form, as was shown recently at the San Diego exposition. One wishes, too, that Mr. Peixotto had not neglected the opportunity for pointing out the fact that unless something is done, and done soon, there will be none of these old buildings left. It is true that they have no immediate connection with the Pilgrim Fathers, but they are national monuments nevertheless, and should be preserved as such. But it is particularly since the American occupation that the destruction has been wholesale, and this has come about not so much by neglect as by improvement. The old buildings, with replastering and care, would have lasted, as they had already lasted, for centuries; but they have succumbed to the innovations of iron roofs or shingled roofs, either too heavy or providing insufficient water-shed for the massive adobe walls.

The old church at Santa Clara, over two centuries old,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

went this way. The church at Nambe, of a like antiquity, met a similar fate; both fine examples of this primitive architecture. And even when the church is not positively destroyed, it is so disguised by improvements in roof or in façade, or by the addition of thin New England steeples as to be quite unrecognizable by its own patron saint. Within the last few years the beautiful old church at Cochiti has been thus "modernized," and the very old church at San Juan has been rebuilt in an atrocious style and completely ruined. The parish priest and his parishioners look upon their improvements with proud eyes. They do not know that what they are destroying is a part of the glory of the Catholic church. Surely those in highest authority must never have visited the New Mexican missions. Or surely it is because this part of the country is so little known that no national action has been taken!

Mr. Peixotto indicates something of the value of this distinctive architecture, although he does not do it full justice, and his pen and ink sketches of the missions and adobes fail to give much of the impression of bulk and plastic surface essentially characteristic of this "free-hand" architecture of the southwest. But his book is valuable in introducing a part of the country not very well known and exceedingly rich in life and color, and he at least takes the traveller off the beaten Fred-Harvey track and gives him a glimpse of the little Mexican villages with their lingering Spanish flavor and old-world charm. These have usually been ignored by writers in favor of the more obviously picturesque Indian pueblos.

Three civilizations, or cultures, meet in New Mexico. It is something of a commentary on our own that, outwardly at least, it is so much the least attractive of the three!

A. C. H.

Women of Belgium

Women of Belgium, by Charlotte Kellogg, with an Introduction by Herbert C. Hoover. New York: Funk Wagnalls Co. $1.00.

MR. HOOVER felt that only a woman could fully understand the nobility and the efficiency with which the Belgian women have met their opportunity of mutual aid, the inspiration they have derived from it, and he accordingly asked Mrs. Vernon U. Kellogg, whose husband was the administrator of the Brussels division of the C. R. B., to spend six months studying the woman's side of the work. Her book is the record of what she saw and felt.

A partial record, since the story of Belgium is not to be told in a volume of 200 pages, or by a member of a Commission pledged to neutrality. If one touches here some of the depths of the tragedy, its dramatic climaxes are not even suggested. What a journalist in search of a "story," or what a good hater like Miss Agnes Repplier would have made of the same chance is curious to reflect upon. Mrs. Kellogg's restraint gives her book convincing value as a document, and it was documentary evidence that she went forth to seek. She has greatly succeeded, as she leads us from the soup lines to The Little Bees, from lace-makers to toy-makers, from cantines for expectant mothers to restaurants for the professional classes, in fixing our attention on construction rather than destruction. We see the endless lines—one and one-quarter millions of them—of silent men and black-shawled women waiting, always in the rain, for the day's pint of soup, but we also see the flowers and flags with which the spotless cantines are decorated, we share the cheerful bustle of their perfectly organized preparation, and the tireless courage and understanding of those who serve. Mrs. Kellogg says that there is not a dreary relief center in all Belgium, though there are many which have had to utilize basements and dingy old buildings. She says that there are many women who have not taken a single day's rest since the beginning of the war. How should they, since every day thousands of hungry children wait at their gates to be not only fed but weighed, watched, medically examined? One woman who directs a cantine for sub-normal children in a crowded section of Brussels has a family of 1,662 for lunch, and she also manages, later in the day, a cantine for 400 mothers and babies, and visits at home the children who have failed to turn up. Under such conditions the word "tired" ceases to have any meaning.

Belgium's triumph in fact brings home the truth of William James's essay on The Energies of Men—the truth that most of us, most of the time, live far below our capacity for activity and accomplishment. Here an exceptional physical and spiritual need has developed an extraordinary capacity to meet that need; if there are still any weaklings in Belgium they have been lifted by the strong. Moreover it is an entirely new sort of charity that has come into being in Belgium: relief founded on scientific efficiency to a degree never before achieved, yet transfused with human warmth, and freed from all humiliation by the magnitude and the equality of a terrible common experience; relief that is genuinely coöperative and fraternal, and preventive rather than palliative, designed, as Mr. Hoover says, "to preserve the laughter of children, not to dry their tears."

One of the most touching aspects of Belgium's case is her sense of dependence on America. Her own leaders, not only King Albert and Queen Elizabeth, whose influence still penetrates from outside, but also and chiefly Cardinal Mercier, have helped her to maintain an attitude of unconquerable defiance that waits upon the day of liberation. Every new order of the military authorities is met with a laugh, every patriotic demonstration is considered worth the fine it brings. But Belgium has felt, more than we deserved—since financially we have played such a small part in her relief—that America has saved her from starvation, and stood as a moral bulwark between her and her conquerors. This book was written before the declaration of war, but one realizes from it what a dark day it must have been for the women of Belgium when Herbert Hoover and his aides, whom they had come to trust like their own brothers, were obliged to go out through the wall of steel. If we have any doubt what our moral and material responsibility to Belgium still is, let us read the message put in Mrs. Kellogg's hands as she was leaving, several months earlier. The English is the Belgian's women's own:

> "Oh, you who are going back in that free country of the United States, tell them all our sufferings, our distress; tell them again and again our cries of alarm, which come from our oppressed and agonized hearts! You have lived and felt what we are living and feeling; we have understood that, higher than charity which gives, you brought us charity which understands and consoles. Your souls have bowed down over ours, our eyes with anxiety are looking in your friendly eyes. Over the big ocean our wishes follow you. Oh, might you there remember the little Belgium! The life which palpitates in her grateful heart

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS OF THE MONTH

TRENCH WARFARE By J. S. SMITH *Net $1.50*

NEW YORK POST says:—An American now fighting with the British Army, Lieut. J. S. Smith, is author of a competent manual upon "Trench Warfare" which is not so technical but that it is full of interest to those curious as to the details of the war. How should a trench be located? How are dugouts made? How make revetments of sand bags or corrugated iron; how make observation posts, support trenches, communication trenches; how construct wire entanglements and barricades? How are percussion bombs and ignition bombs made, and how do they differ from "mechanical bombs"? What are the technical instructions offered a sniper? How are frost bites and trench feet prevented? The European Armies would have given its weight in gold for the first edition of a book like this in 1914.

The Problem of Human Peace

Studied from the standpoint of a Scientific Catholicism by MALCOLM QUIN. *Net $3.00*

Showing that in Catholicism there is a positive and permanent content of goodness, beauty and truth which, scientifically understood and completed, will lead to the pursuit of perfection and to the attainment of a human peace.

The Economy and Finance of the War

By A. C. PIGOU. *Net 60c.*

A discussion of the real cost of the war and the way in which it should be met.

The Destruction of Merchant Ships Under International Law

By SIR FREDERICK SMITH. *Net $1.75*

A clear statement of the case for international law as opposed to international anarchy.

The Russian Problem

By PAUL VINOGRADOFF. *Net 75c*

Exiled from Russia because of his radical ideas. Showing clearly how Russia is progressing, what reforms she needs and is accomplishing, what is her psychology.

Russian Court Memoirs 1914-16

Net $5.00

Fully illustrated with Portraits of the Modern Russian Court and Russian Leaders.

Intimate glimpses of the life of royalties and social leaders in Petrograd. One of the most interesting books that has yet appeared about Russia, for it is written within and with full knowledge.

Russian Memories

By MADAM OLGA NOVIKOFF. Fully Illustrated with Portraits. *Net $3.50*

Few women in history have played so important a part in international affairs as Madam Novikoff. General Ignatieff referred to her as "a gallant and intrepid warrior" and Disraeli called her "The M. P. for Russia in England."

The Golden Days of the Early English Church

From the Arrival of Theodore to the Death of Bede. By SIR HENRY H. HOWORTH. Illustrated; 3 vols. *Net $15*

The authority with which this book has been written has been acknowledged by the leading scholars.

The Culture and Diseases of the Sweet Pea

By J. J. TAUBENHAUS, Chief of the Division of Plant Pathology and Physiology of the Texas Agriculture Experiment Station. With an Introduction by MELVILLE T. COOK, Professor of Plant Pathology at Rutgers College. *Net $2.00*

The book is the result of five consecutive years devoted to research on the diseases of the sweet pea.

Studies in Insect Life and Other Essays

By A. E. SHIPLEY. *Net $3.50*

Giving not only some delightful chapters on insects and war, on the honey bee and the bumble bee, on grouse disease and on the romance of the sea deep, but he gives also an account of Zoology as understood in Shakespeare's time, and of the revival of science in the seventeenth century.

The New Golf

By P. A. VAILE. Revised and Enlarged Edition. *Net $2.00*

The passing of the cleek—an epochal event in golf. You must know of it. And you must learn how to do without it—and improve your game. The only book that can tell you.

Walker's Rhyming Dictionary of the English Language

In which the whole language is arranged according to its terminations. Revised and Enlarged by J. LONGMUIR. *Net $1.50*

The Soul of Ulster

By ERNEST W. HAMILTON, Author of the First Seven Divisions. *Net $1.25*

A virile, unprejudiced and thoroughly informed work that will be found more illuminating upon the Irish question than any other book of recent years.

Pebbles on the Shore

A New Volume in the Wayfarers Library. *Net 50c*

A series of essays published anonymously over the signature of "Alpha of the Plow," it is said to be by a well-known English author and journalist.

Irene to the Rescue

By MAY BALDWIN. Author of Phyllis McPhilemy. *Net $1.50*

A delightful story of an English girl's fight for the right.

Oliver Hastings, V. C.

By ESCOTT LYNN, Author of In Khaki for the King. *Net $1.50*

A realistic story for boys of the great war.

A Naturalist in Borneo

By ROBERT W. C. SHELFORD. *Net $5*

Do you want a legitimate distraction for an hour at a time? Then purchase the book and you will find it much more thrilling than any novel of adventure, for it is all adventure in the fairy land of science and almost more incredible than any fairy romance conceived. Nevertheless it is packed with undiluted truth from the first page to the last. It is a work destined to become one of the classics of natural history, to rank with books by Bates and Humboldt, Wallace and Fabre.

Two Summers in the Ice Wilds of Eastern Karakorum

By FANNY BULLOCK WORKMAN and WILLIAM HUNTER WORKMAN. *Net $8.00*

The exploration of nineteen hundred square miles of mountain and glacier. With three maps and one hundred and forty-one illustrations by the author.

The New Era in Canada

By the following writers: Stephen Leacock, Sir Edmund Walker, Prof. F. D. Adams, Sir John Willison, John W. Dafoe, Miss Marjory MacMurchy, Dr. Herbert Symonds, Sir Clifford Sifton, Archbishop McNeil, G. Frank Beer, Prof. G. M. Wrong, Peter MacArthur. Essays dealing with the upbuilding of the Canadian Commonwealth. *Net $1.75*

Canada the Spellbinder

By LILIAN WHITING. *Net $2.50*

Describing its scenic beauties with radiant enthusiasm and growing appreciation and showing how these delights are easily accessible to travelers. It gives excellent impressions of present-day Canadian activities in town and country and forecasts industrial and commercial developments which will make Canada the wonder of the world.

The England of Shakespeare

By P. H. DITCHFIELD. Fully illustrated. *Net $2.00*

It is a thoroughly informed, sympathetic and highly successful attempt to draw the real background for the living figure of the great Shakespeare, so that we may see him living among his fellows in Elizabethan London and the Jacobean countryside.

Disease in Milk

The Remedy: Pasteurization. The Life Work of Nathan Straus. By LINA GUTHERZ STRAUS. *Net $2.50*

How a layman met an emergency affecting the lives of babies and applied the remedy in advance of scientific demonstration.

POSTAGE EXTRA. AT ALL BOOKSTORES.

E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY, 681 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IMMORTALITY

Out of the World War has come a quickened interest in the Survival of Personality after Death. The following are the most recent books

RAYMOND: or Life and Death

BY SIR OLIVER LODGE

Presenting carefully weighed evidence to the effect that Sir Oliver's youngest son Raymond, killed over a year ago in France, has been and still is, in personal communication with those whom he loved in terrestrial life. "Contains a matter-of-fact account, in minutest detail, of conditions in the spirit world."—*New York Times.* "A startling demonstration of life beyond the grave."—*Kansas City Star.* *Illustrated. Octavo. Net* $3.00.

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY, Publishers.
Publishers in America for Hodder & Stoughton

The Hereafter
SOME VIEWS RESPECTING A FUTURE LIFE

BY SAMUEL WADDINGTON

On no problem at the present time is there a greater diversity of opinion than on that of the possibility of a continuation of life after death. The author, in this timely volume, sets forth in the clearest possible terms the views of those writers, both ancient and modern, who have written on the subject. *Cloth, Net* $1.25.

JOHN LANE COMPANY, Publishers, New York.

PSYCHICAL INVESTIGATIONS

BY J. ARTHUR HILL

Being a verbatim record of sittings with certain well-known mediums, among them that mentioned by Sir Oliver Lodge in "Raymond." With evidence that led the author from agnosticism to belief in the survival of personality beyond death together with chapters on the psychical phenomena of earlier times, the telepathic difficulty, the influence of rapport objects, etc., etc. *Octavo. Net* $2.00.

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY, Publishers,
Publishers in America for Hodder & Stoughton

PSYCHICAL AND SUPERNORMAL PHENOMENA

By PAUL JOIRE

Observations and experiments by a noted scientist on phenomena outside the normal—abnormal dreams, telepathy, crystal gazing, automatic writing, moving of objects without contact, etc. Not only does the author deal with his subject in a thoroughly scientific and impartial spirit, but he makes of his experiments into the occult a compelling and fascinating narrative *Illustrated. Cloth, 8vo., net $3.00.*

FREDERICK A. STOKES COMPANY.

OUR HIDDEN FORCES

By ÉMILE BOIRAC

Translated with a Preface by Dr. W. de Kerlor.

The mysteries of hypnotism, animo-magnetism and spiritism explained by the leading psychologist of France. Prof. Boirac shows that every human being has latent psychic forces of practical value. *"Exceedingly interesting. The ideas suggested and the accounts of experiments conducted must arouse new trains of thought in any reader."* Boston Transcript. *Cloth, 8vo., net, $2.00.*

FREDERICK A. STOKES COMPANY.

she owes it to you! You are our hope, our anchor. Help us! Do not abandon the work of charity you have undertaken.

"Our endless gratitude goes to you, and from father to children, in the hovel and in the palace, we shall repeat your great heart, your high idealism, your touching charity." E. S. S.

Belated Excellence

The Good Girl, by Vincent O'Sullivan. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co. $1.50.

THE GOOD GIRL was originally published in England and warmly appreciated there before Mr. O'Sullivan's own American countrymen had ever heard of the author. Although the recent success of W. H. Hudson's stories and essays have revealed that it is sometimes worth the chance, it is always risky to reprint a book which first met with little except critical welcome. But in Mr. O'Sullivan's case, whatever the practical issue of the experiment, the genuine artistic contribution should reconcile the publishers to even a moderate succès d'estime, should their venture with the book do no more. For it is certain that an American novelist of power is disclosed in The Good Girl, which the fugitive essays that Mr. O'Sullivan has had published here in magazines hardly justified us in expecting. There is a massiveness and veracity of portraiture in this novel, blended with a sudden illuminating humor—the indubitable mark of real insight and creative force. The character studies are miles away from the conventional brisk American impressionism. Unfortunately, the accent of The Good Girl is wholly antebellum, in the sense that we all seem to have passed beyond the mood in which love-stories of this peculiar type would meet with a response. All the characters are English, and what misgivings we have as to the veracity of the picture are the result of a new conception of English life since the war. It is difficult not to be impatient to-day with a hero like Vendred, so swamped in his ugly, if obstinate and life-long, love-affair. The milieu, too, of flashy and frank parasitism—such as is depicted in Maugham's comedy, Our Betters—cannot in spite of its cleverness and grip on the character of the parvenus and bounders that inhabit it meet our more vivid interests. The Good Girl is still a compelling and provocative story of the weakness wrought by love. But Mr. O'Sullivan is writing a new novel, soon to be published, wherein we shall see if the force and verbal suavity so clearly attested in The Good Girl can adapt themselves to the new situation and the new outlines of human society wrought by the war.

Contributors

to this issue

ALFRED A. ZIMMERN is an eminent English publicist at present attached to the Reconstruction Committee. He is the author of The Greek Commonwealth.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE is a member of the Home Missions Council Missionary Education Movement and is the author of Missions Striking Home and World Missions from the Home Base.

EDITH WYATT is a novelist and literary critic. She is the author of Every One His Own Way, True Love, and Making Both Ends Meet.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED